

## **COPYRIGHT WARNING**

### **Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL LIBRARY  
99 BRATTLE STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

7.5.67

#17

The Effect of Contemporary Theology  
on the Question of Anglican Orders

an essay presented by  
Allan Brewster King, Jr., A.B., LL.B.

in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity  
The Episcopal Theological School  
April 12, 1967

## Contents

Introduction .....	1.
Chapter One: A Brief History of the Question of the Validity of Orders .....	1.
Chapter Two: The Church, a Prime Reality for Christians .....	15.
Chapter Three: The Sign of Holy Orders .....	42.
Chapter Four: The Status of Separated Holy Orders .....	78.
Chapter Five: The Status of Anglican Orders ...	93.
Notes .....	107.
Bibliography .....	111.

## Introduction

It is not unreasonable to ask why it seems important to enter again into a discussion of the validity of anglican Orders. This question has been mercifully ignored during the last few years, and it is at least possible that the new spirit of ecumenism and generosity between Christians has relegated issues such as this to the annals of Church History. It is quite appropriate, then, to ask whether it is wise to open again this issue which has in the past brought much heart-ache to anglican and other Christians.

While this writer is quite ready to admit that this particular issue, the validity of anglican Orders, has been a difficult question for anglicans and others for many years, and while he is forced to recognize that it might yet become again a point of active division, it is his opinion that this issue can no longer be ignored. It cannot be ignored for a number of reasons. All of them can be summed up in the statement: the time is ripe for an investigation of this issue. This is to say that there are times when certain issues ought not to be discussed, at least not widely. The atmosphere which surrounds them is too heated; the mood is too polemical. On the other hand, it is possible to avoid the discussion of issues until it is too late to do anything constructive about them. It is quite possible to be so ambivalent, or so unconcerned, that others pass one

by on the grounds that one is not concerned with the questions which they consider to be of importance.

Thus, just as a marriage may be entered into too hastily, and may therefore end in divorce or other tragedy, or alternatively a happy and life-long union may be missed because a couple refuses to be serious about what is happening in their life together, so too it is possible for the Christian community to act too soon, or too late.

But, just as it is possible to be hasty or tardy in the discussion of any given issue which divides Christians, so too it must be that there will be a series of times when it is at least appropriate to discuss such subjects. It is this writer's opinion that we live in such a time, and that the issue of the validity of anglican Orders is an issue now ripe for discussion.

Still one may reasonably ask: Why this issue? Why not discuss something else which divides Christians? Why is it that the "validity" of anglican Orders should be of such importance? Again, the answer to these questions has to do with the times in which we live. To be able to debate and argue over the "validity" of some group of Christians' Orders is a symptom of an "establishment" situation for the Church. It is only possible to carry on this type of quasi-juridical argument when the Church is quite sure of itself, and quite secure. Further, such a discussion can only be carried on when the lines of demarcation between the Church and the world are very certain, and when the

Church is herself "visible" in a fashion such that it is possible to make confident statements about what she is, and who her members are. Under such conditions it may be possible to carry on an argument about the "validity" of someone's Orders. It may be possible, although the history of the discussion of this question shows how remarkably difficult it has in fact been to deal with it.

But if the discussion of this issue has generally presupposed a stable, "establishment" situation for the Church, why ought we to attempt to discuss it anew now, in our times, when the position of the Church is hardly like unto that of an "establishment", and much more like unto that of a "diaspora"? Is not this precisely one of those times when we ought not discuss issues of this sort?

In one sense of the word we ought not discuss the issue of anglican ordinations. It should be unnecessary. With all of the jobs which Christians have to do in the world today, it is a tragedy that they must spend time and energy on points of this sort. Agreed. But, sadly, it is disagreement on points just such as this one concerning the validity of anglican Orders which keep up and stake out the lines of division which separate Christians, which divide Christ's Body the Church, and which make her less able to do her work in the world, and less attractive to those who know her not, and to whom she is sent. For it is a fact of the modern situation of the Church that she is still carrying around baggage of this particular sort.

Although the Church today yearns in her heart to be the pilgrim Church which she knows herself called to be, it is a fact that she is carrying a great deal of baggage which it is hard for pilgrims to bear. Some of this baggage must be jettisoned. It is in hopes of aiding this unburdening that we would return again to the question of the "validity" of anglican Orders.

That is a major reason why we ought to look at this issue anew. But there are others. For some anglicans the question of anglican Orders is constitutive of their being The Church, or, as they might prefer, a "branch" of The Church. At least so they have thought. Yet it is clear that there are those Christians who dispute the validity of the very Orders which anglicans hold dear. Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians have made it quite clear that they hold anglican Orders to be either invalid, or of very dubious validity. These bodies therefore hold officially, or act in fact, as if anglicans were not a "branch" of The Church. Anglicans are treated as sectarian Christians, no different in this area than their Protestant brethren. To be sure, we are describing only the "official" level, and it is quite true that many Roman and Orthodox Christians, some at the highest levels in their Communion, hold personal views which differ greatly from the official views expressed by their bodies.

Still, what kind of a position does this put the

Anglican in? He is forced to take one of two roads if he is to remain within the framework of anglicanism. He may simply state that upon all the evidence the other side, whomsoever that may be, is wrong. This is a traditional answer, and when it is coupled with an articulate defense of the validity of anglican Orders it has some cogency. Still, it is the old process of making a response to someone else's initial position. It always has about it the atmosphere of defense, and often that of polemic as well. The other possible road for anglicans to take is to assert that the validity of anglican Orders can not be solved on the basis of historical or theological investigation, and must therefore be understood in the light of the manifest workings of the Holy Spirit within anglicanism, all of which must be seen as the sign that the Anglican Communion is, indeed, a "branch" of The Church. That is, that the manner in which anglican Orders partake in the necessary "validity" to be constitutive of The Church is ultimately a mystery. The appeal to mystery is always dangerous. It is the death-blow to theological thinking, for it is not the product of theological thinking as such, but rather the affirmation that theological thinking is not able to reach the desired goal. The appeal to mystery is also dangerous because it is all too easy to make it too early in the investigation. Theology does in the end find its consummation in the adoration of the Mystery who is God,



but one must be careful not to announce that one has come to the limits of theology before one, in fact, has. Such is one of the current dangers for anglicans.

It is, therefore, important for anglican Christians to be certain that they have really considered the issue of the "validity" of anglican Orders. They must be certain that they are not casually saying that the "other side" is wrong, or alternatively that the whole issue is bound up in mystery.

There are, however, yet further reasons for investigating the issue of anglican Orders. Important among them is the stress which is now being placed upon the episcopate in the various discussions and schemes for the reunion of Christians. In each of these the issue of anglican Orders comes up. Most relevantly to us in the United States, the Consultation on Church Union has progressed in its discussions to the point that it is generally agreed that a United Church must have episcopal orders, and that these must be of the "historic episcopate".<sup>1</sup> By this is meant the acquisition of "valid" orders from some body which is able to transmit them. The body intended at the moment is the Protestant Episcopal Church. The question is: Are the Orders of the Protestant Episcopal Church "valid"? That is a question for those who stand outside the Episcopal Church and seek reunion with her. It is also a question for those within the Episcopal Church. Are we, perhaps, offering to give something which we do not have to give? The question of the

validity of anglican Orders is, therefore, of some importance at the moment. It is also a problem of conscience for anglicans, for if we are really unsure of our Orders, can we offer them to others without qualification?

But not only is the question of anglican Orders one which is important to anglicans because they have been told that they do not have them, and important to others because they are looking to anglicans to receive them. The question whether anglican Orders are "valid" is a traditional issue in and of itself. For, it is argued, if anglican Orders are not valid, then anglican bishops are not bishops, anglican priests not priests, anglican deacons not deacons, anglican sacraments not sacraments, and so on and on. This is really the heart of the matter. It is summed up in the question: Is it necessary that a Christian body, to be a part of the Church, have "valid" orders, and therefore, "valid" bishops, priests, deacons, sacraments, etc? For a very long time it has been the position of anglican and other "catholic" bodies that the answer to this question has to be "Yes". Validity is required. It is on the basis of this question and its answer that anglicans have been declared separated from Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians, and it has been on the same basis that anglicans have separated themselves from Protestant bodies whom they believed had no "valid" orders.

There have been attempts in later days to get around the impasse which is created by this question and its

answer. There have been some who have valiantly tried to demonstrate that the answer did not have to be "Yes", that it could be "No", or "Perhaps", or "Sometimes". But it is the opinion of this writer that the answers to the question whether "valid" orders are necessary to the Church have not necessarily been wrong, but rather that it is the question itself which is inappropriate, and the cause of much misunderstanding and division.

That is to say that one cannot ask whether "valid" Orders are necessary except from the perspective of the "establishment". One cannot utilize the concepts necessary to place the question in the first instance, unless one has a certain understanding of The True Church which is presupposed by the question. It is furthermore just this understanding of the "true" Church which is so much in doubt today, and which makes the continued putting of the question in the old categories so anachronistic. The Church of the diaspora is far less able to claim a visible "trueness" such as is required to operate with this question. The modern ecumenical movement has brought home to Christians of all persuasions that they can no longer claim for themselves the adjective "true". The "true" Church is in one sense, thankfully, no longer existent, and at the same time, it is wholly and completely real in the bits and pieces which are now the Church, and which we are coming to realize by their very fragmentation deny the unity which the "true" Church must perforce have.

The time has come for all Christians to put aside old statements of problems, and the old solutions which they produced, when those problems and solutions stand in the way of the formation and becoming visible of the one Church which is the Body of Christ in, for, but not of the world. This operation has well begun, but it must be continued, and it must be continued precisely in the kind of self-criticism which is most painful. Separated Christians must now examine themselves with even more fervor than they have in the past examined and criticised others who were separated from them. It is to perform such an act of self-surgery that the following re-investigation of the question of anglican Orders is undertaken. It presupposes that anglicans will be willing to make their own, where needs be, the kind of humility and honesty which they have expected of others, and which they also know to be among the fruits of the Holy Spirit. It further presupposed that it is God's Will that His Church be one, and that those things which ultimately stand in the way of the oneness of His People are neither His doing, nor are they neutral, but are simply the effective work of the Evil One. To rid ourselves of baggage which divides Christians, and to make more visible the pilgrim and servant nature of the Church, are the only goals.

## Chapter One:

### A Brief History of the Question of the Validity of Orders

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the phenomenon of Holy Orders among Christians. How are we to understand "priesthood", "ministry" and "ordination" today? What new light must be shed on our understanding of Holy Orders in this time when the reunification of Christians looms so large as a possibility? Thus, this paper is not really one which is interested in the historical narrative concerning how it is that we came to have separated churches, and how it is that some Christians have ended up fighting with other Christians about the meaning and "validity" of the other's Orders. Nonetheless, we do have to begin our investigation with a brief review of the historical background to our common problems in order to agree on the definition of certain terms, and in order to isolate the direction of the discussion as it has manifested itself through the events which have led up to the present situation.

To begin with, there are certain concepts which have generally been used in discussions of Holy Orders. Words such as "orders", "succession", "apostolicity" and "validity" are common in this field. While their meanings have varied somewhat over the years, they have maintained a generally firm connotation.

The concept of orders is of long standing. It is

related to the concept of gradations manifested in the Pauline lists of functions within the congregation.<sup>1</sup> The word itself carries the connotation of the latin civil idea of governmental rank or office. The number of ranks or offices in the Church has not been constant, however. Tertullian, for example, included "widows" among those who were in orders.<sup>2</sup> The western usage has, however, been relatively consistent since the early middle ages. The concept of order or Orders has been used to describe the official rank in the Church's heirarchy which a person holds. These ranks, or orders, have been divided into two groups: major and minor. This distinction is preserved in the Roman Church to this day. The group of minor Orders includes such as acolytes, lectors and exorcists.<sup>3</sup> Major Orders are the Sub-diaconate, the Diaconate, the Priesthood and the Episcopate.<sup>4</sup> The major Orders (without the Sub-diaconate) are what is usually referred to by non-Roman Catholics when they speak of "Holy Orders". Thus, in this paper, we will be using the term "Orders" in the sense of major Orders above described.

One element which we will have to be careful to recognize is the combination of the concepts of "office" and "jurisdiction" within the idea of Holy Orders. The person who holds a "rank" in the Church is usually the possessor both of an "office" and of "jurisdiction". Thus, the governmental functions of the person "ordered" will be

seen to be divisible from the essence of the office or order to which the person is admitted.

A second concept which has often appeared in discussions on the nature of Holy Orders is that of succession. This concept usually refers to the continuity which exists internally within an "order". Thus, a bishop is said to be in succession when an examination of his consecrators shows that these consecrators were, in turn, themselves consecrated by bishops whose consecrators were "in succession". The concept of succession can be understood in at least two senses. The first is tactile. Assuming that a consecrator stands in "succession" (whatever that may mean), then a bishop consecrated by him can be said to be "in succession" as a result primarily of the "laying-on-of-hands" which occurs in the consecration rite. Succession in this sense is tactile; hands have been laid on the head of the newly consecrated bishop by one whose tactile genealogy stretches back in time unbroken. One of the arguments which can be advanced against separated Christians' ministries is that their ministers do not stand "in succession". By this may be meant that the tactile succession of the laying-on-of-hands has been broken in their case.

A second sense in which the concept of succession may be understood is that succession consists in being a member of a faith community which can trace its "faith genealogy" backwards in time. Thus, for example, anglicans might be said to be in succession from the Caroline Divines

not only because of tactile continuity, but also because of a continuity of teaching or faith. The Eastern Churches put much stress on this concept, as is manifested in their understanding of the concept "Holy Tradition".<sup>5</sup> An eastern bishop is one who stands not only in tactile succession, but one who also holds the Holy Tradition, or the understanding of the Faith which has marked the eastern communities of Christians.

In connection with Holy Orders, succession is usually linked with the concept of apostolicity. This concept tries to express the fact that the succession which is transmitted in the Church is of apostolic origin. Thus, if succession is seen primarily as tactile, the succession is said to begin with the laying-on-of-hands by the Apostles. Where, on the other hand, succession is seen to reside primarily in the confession of a traditional faith ( as in the case of many Protestant concepts of succession) the test for any current confession will be whether it is the confession of the Apostolic faith. Apostolicity is thus a type of justifying or validating principle. Problems therefore obviously arise when it cannot be proven that tactile succession has been preserved, or that the faith held by the community or individual today is in fact that of the Apostles.

This brings us to the final term often branded about in discussions of Holy Orders, namely: validity. At its root, validity is a purely legal term. It described the result of a prior decision about the terms for acceptability



of Orders. If "valid" Orders are defined as those received from a bishop in tactile, apostolic succession, then Orders received from a (so-called) bishop not in tactile succession are, by definition, "invalid". This is the fashion in which the word has been used in discussions of Orders. We must bear in mind, however, that a term such as "valid" always requires a referent of some kind. There has to be some other concept which defines what is going to be "valid". "Valid" does not have a meaning apart from the conditions for validity.

This understanding is particularly important when we consider the possibility that certain conditions which have historically been required for "validity" may no longer be capable of certain proof by the very nature of the fact that we are less sure of the certain proof of some things in the twentieth century than we were before. For example, although the Church's witness has long been that the early Bishops received their consecrations at the hands of the Apostles, we possess no signed consecration warrants for these first non-Apostle bishops. We do have credible evidence for the continuity of tactile succession from a very early period, but we do not have complete evidence and certain proof for all of the claimed chain of succession. Thus, the validity of all episcopal Orders can be considered to be open to the objection of "invalidity" simply because we cannot prove tactile succession from the Apostles.

This problem of uncertainty surrounds the concept of apostolic succession as it has been understood. We must

admit that we really are unable to "prove" in a convincing fashion that the local bishop is a tactile successor to the Apostles any more than we can "prove" that the traditional definition of the Trinity is correct. It has been a step in the right direction, therefore, to begin to use the phrase "historic episcopate" to describe what we used to try to term "apostolic succession".

In general, all the terms we have been discussing have depended upon a legalistic, rational metaphysical system which is probably no longer shared by the majority of men, indeed, probably not even by the majority of Christians. When, then, issues such as Church unity are raised and expressed in terms which do not presuppose this older metaphysic, but nonetheless are articulated in the vocabulary of the older system, a serious problem results because many may understand the old words to have the old meanings which, then, make little sense in the philosophical system of the current discussions. (This problem is raised at this point so that we will be aware of its existence and attempt to avoid such confusions in the pages that follow.)

In addition to the problems which Christians have historically had with certain terms, such as those we have just discussed, there have also been significant problems raised by the very existence of formal divisions among Christians. The understandings of Holy Orders have been influenced by the fact that Christians are in schism from

eachother. Indeed, these divisions are often most visible precisely in the area of Orders. Thus: Can an Episcopalian take Communion in a Methodist Church? The usual answer is "No". The reason most often given is that the Methodists have no valid Holy Orders, and consequently no Priesthood which can offer the Eucharist. Thus, in the end we are informed that there is no Communion to receive, no valid one that is! Thusly the problem of Orders is involved with the fact of schism, whether between Anglican and Methodist, or between Roman and Anglican, or between Eastern and Western.

The schism of East and West has had little immediate effect upon the status of Holy Orders. Both parties have continued to claim their Orders are valid and, indeed, that they are the true Church. While Rome has continued to recognize the formal validity of Eastern Orders, the same has not always been true in reverse. This is largely due to the Eastern understanding that "validity" is more closely bound up with the purity of tradition, and since the West is "clearly" heretical, its Orders must, therefore, also be somehow tainted.

The practical effect of the schism with the East has been the isolation of Eastern Christians, and in some sense it must be said that their Orders have been "degraded" in that they are not understood and accepted in any regular course in the domestic experience of the West. Although their validity is acknowledged formally, their validity

is challenged practically by their not being used or made manifest in the West.

Schism between the Roman Church and the Continental reformed Churches has raised the problem of validity to a level of greater importance. The status of Holy Orders as between separated Western Christians has been constantly debated since the time of separation. Whereas the schism in the West was founded largely on theological, national, social and economic grounds, the type of issue which perpetuates these divisions, when so many of the original causes have been seen to be solved or to be solvable, is none other than the legalistic issue of the validity of separated ministries. Validity seems to be closely related to the psychological dimensions of schism. To acknowledge the other's validity, and to cast doubt on one's own, seems to be a particularly hard thing for a man to do.

Western continental reformed Christians have had their Orders called into doubt by most of Christendom. The arguments range from asserting a break in tactile succession for some (which occurred),<sup>6</sup> through arguing the outright rejection of ministry in any historic sense for others (which is also true).<sup>7</sup> The schism in the West has thus frequently caused these separated Christians to be put on the defensive about the validity of their Orders, and by implication about the validity of their lives as Christians. The ecumenical movement has made great progress in bringing separated western Christians to see that their separated

lives as Christians have all been blessed by God, and that the gifts which the Holy Spirit has made manifest in each of them are evidences that their Christian lives have indeed been "validated". Even the ecumenical movement, however, has been able to make little progress in overcoming the controversy concerning the validity of separated ministries. In the various proposals for Church Union there are schemes for the reconciliation of separated ministries which range from the outright re-ordination of clergy who have been "ordained" already in separated "invalid" ministries, to proposals for the common laying-on-of-hands for the reception of whatever grace may have been lacking in the prior separated ministries.<sup>8</sup> So ingrained is the problem of validity that the more "liberal" schemes for the reconciliation of ministries appear to be in danger of being opposed by many reuniting Christians on the grounds that these liberal schemes would tend to reflect poorly on the historic validity of their own prior ministries. Such is the effect of schism in the West.

Special attention is paid here to the situation of anglicans. This is so partly because anglicans have traditionally claimed to be able to comprehend both sides of the situation. Anglicans have claimed catholic liturgy and orders, and an evangelical understanding of the mission of the Church combined with a theology which is rational, and necessarily imprecise. This is not to play down the importance of the anglican witness in divided Christianity.

In many ways, anglicans have been able to avoid some of the major pitfalls which their separated brethren to the right and to the left have encountered. But it is this very fact which is a danger for anglicans today. The fact that they have survived to some extent intact tends to make anglicans think that they must have been doing something right. So today, anglicans still strongly maintain the validity of their Orders, and consider this issue to be crucial. They have been told by Rome, and by much of the East, that their Orders, and hence their Sacraments, are invalid. The Protestant West, in turn, has told anglicans that formal validity makes no difference, but rather that their confession and their life is what is important. (In a real way, anglicans have opted for neither, but rather for a compromise position subsumed under a national, cultural way of life.)

Today the tables have been turned. The national way of life has become international. Roman Catholics, at least, have taken the position in Vatican Council II that confession and life are also central to the Christian experience.<sup>9</sup> Protestants have found that historic confessions and modes of life can become as stultifying as historic legalisms about Holy Orders and Sacraments. All in all it is very confusing, but that is what we would expect of a time of change and growth.

In the face of the need for change manifested in the growing support for moves toward unity between Christians, anglicans have made substantial attempts to keep with or

ahead of the times. The Lambeth Conferences' statements<sup>10</sup> on Church union have been landmarks. Anglican cooperation in the Faith and Order movement, and in the Life and Work movement, has been notable, as has been their support of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches in America. Anglicans have also been involved in all the significant moves for organic Church union, as for example in the Church of South India, and in the American Consultation on Church Union.

Historically, however, anglicans have also asserted the validity of their Orders in the face of those who have rejected them. As early as the Jacobean debates between Fischer and Laud, anglicans have claimed the validity of their Orders.<sup>11</sup> In the nineteenth century, the Oxford Movement hastened the day when anglicans would find it almost unbearable to continue to be rejected by Rome and the East. Thus, in the last decade of the last century, representations were made to certain Roman authorities that the question<sup>12</sup> of the validity of anglican Orders should be reopened. Largely because the representations were not made by the official anglican heirarchy, and because they were found to be not altogether accurate, as in the case of suggesting that the Church of England was largely composed of the members of the Oxford Movement party,<sup>13</sup> Rome was unwilling to make a decision in favor of the anglican claim. The bull Apostolicae Curiae<sup>14</sup> which formally condemns anglican Orders was the result. It is saddening to speculate what the result of

that review might have been could it have taken place today, and at the request of the anglican heirarchy, perhaps the assembled bishops at Lambeth.

Anglicans continued to assert their Orders in the face of Apostolicae Curiae, although their assertion took more the form of a defense. The Responsio Archiepiscoporum,<sup>15</sup> for example, assumes that the issue is joined, and that it is "validity". Even so, in the second decade of this century attempts, first unofficial and then quasi-official, were made to open the issue again. These became known as the<sup>16</sup> Malines Conversations, after the place at which they occurred. The Malines Conversations were extinguished both by the death of Cardinal Mercier, who had been their principal Roman supporter, and by their tacit condemnation at Rome.

With the founding of the World Council of Churches, anglican ecumenical involvement turned largely towards the other members of that body. Most recently, however, the concern for reconciliation with Rome has reasserted itself. In the light of Vatican Council II, and<sup>17</sup> the joint declaration of Archbishop Ramsey and Pope Paul VI, Anglo-Roman conversations have begun again with fresh zeal and hope.

Anglican relations with the East have been more or less at a standstill since before World War II. Some autocephalous eastern Churches, such as the Roumanian, have been well disposed toward anglican claims. Others, such as the Russian, have not been. The problem is complicated by the fact that no single eastern Church feels free to act alone in matters of this sort, and therefore any objecting



Church has an effective veto over the recognition of anglican claims.

Anglican Orders have been recognized by some "catholic" Christians, especially by the Old Catholics, and Old Catholic<sup>18</sup> consecrators have taken part in some Anglican consecrations. In terms of the old arguments about the "validity" of Orders, this recognition may have some weight in persuading others who already recognize the validity of Old Catholic Orders to recognize anglican validity as well.

In the current ecumenical situation, however, the question of the validity of anglican Orders is still a recurrent one. Indeed, the problem of the validity of separated Orders is generally a crucial one for the ecumenical movement. Most of the discussions of this question still depend upon the older concepts of "validity", which in turn are based upon a traditional understanding of law and metaphysics. One of the current facets of this problem which has perhaps not been adequately isolated and exposed is the fact that the older concepts of law and metaphysics are themselves no longer universally accepted among Christians. While there is a growing awareness that such is the case, much of the discussion about the "validity" of separated Orders still rests upon presuppositions which are themselves hidden, and often neither understood nor accepted.

Thus, the current need is for a new theological approach to the whole area of ministry in the Church which will provide perspectives for developing solutions to our

common problems. This need has become especially apparent in the light of Vatican Council II, where we have all observed that many radical re-assessments of the traditional understandings of the Church have been made. Perhaps more importantly, Vatican II has made clear to all Christians that change is possible within the Body of Christ, even though it is often painful. The very fact that the developments in Roman theology which were manifested at Vatican II could have taken place requires all who may still have areas of disagreement with their Christian brothers to reexamine seriously what they have been saying in order to see whether there might not now be a better way to make the witness they feel they must make, yet make it in a way in which their brother can share it with them. It is to the task of providing some possible new perspectives on the theological issues involved with the doctrine of Holy Orders that we turn in the following chapter. It is hoped that a brotherly sharing of new perspectives might be a more attainable goal than the conversion of the brother to some of the traditional arguments, which by now have been extensively argued out.

## Chapter Two:

### The Church, a Prime Reality for Christians

We must begin our theological investigation of the nature of Holy Orders, and consequently the issue as to what it means to discuss their "validity", with a theological investigation of the Church. We must begin with the Church for a number of reasons. First, because any discussion of Holy Orders is necessarily subsumed under the theological doctrine of the Church. Second, because in our day the theological understanding of the Church is undergoing vast restructuring with the result that the investigation of issues which are properly subsumed under the category "the Church" may take very different directions, and come out with very different results, than was the case but a short while ago.

More central, however, than these formal reasons for beginning with a consideration of the Church is the phenomenology of the manner in which a person encounters God. This encounter happens in the first instance in the fellowship of the Church. This is not to say that God is not, indeed, mediated to others through those who have Holy Orders as well as through those who do not. But it is to assert that God is primarily made manifest by Christians, irrespective of any status given by Holy Orders. God is encountered in those who are identified simply as members of the Church. It is

in the community which is the Church that the fullness of God's revelation is made known. Thus, an appreciation of what the Church is will bring us to the perspective necessary to investigate what the function and nature of the ordained ministry within the Church may be.

We begin, then, with an investigation of the Church. Indeed, this appears to be the major theological interest-area of our times. For today, after centuries of understanding the Church primarily as an heirarchical institution for the salvation of men's souls, Christians are coming to see the Church in new and fruitful ways.

As anglicans we ought to begin with some description of the Church which has been treasured in our theological heritage. Such an example exists in the Second Office of the <sup>1</sup>Offices of Instruction. There, four questions and answers set forth a traditional understanding of the Church. They follow, slightly rearranged for clarity:

1. Q. What is the Church?

A. The Church is the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and all baptized people are the members.

2. Q. How is the Church described in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds?

A. The Church is described in the Creeds as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

3. Q. What do we mean by these words?

A. We mean that the Church is One; because it is one Body under one Head; Holy; because the Holy Spirit dwells in it and sanctifies its members;

Catholic; because it is universal, holding earnestly the Faith for all time, in all countries, and for all people; and is sent to preach the Gospel to the whole world; Apostolic; because it continues steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship.

4. Q. When were you made a member of the Church?

A. I was made a member of the Church when I was baptized. <sup>2</sup>

In addition to this anglican expression of the doctrine of the Church we might also consider the relevant portion of Article XIX of the Articles of Religion.<sup>3</sup> There, under the heading "of the Church" it is stated:

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same...." <sup>4</sup>

It will be noted that there are subtle differences between these two anglican understandings of the nature of the Church. In the former, the basic statements about the Church are ontological in character. They describe the Church as a Being. The Church is a Body of which one becomes a member by baptism. It is a Body of which Christ is its Head. It is universal; it holds the faith for all time, for all men, everywhere. The Church, then, is seen as something which exists, and which exists not simply or punctiliarly, but rather has a continuing existence in space and time. The Church is described in space-time categories as something which is a continuum.

The description of the Church in Article XIX is at

least susceptible of another interpretation. The description there set forth could be termed associational and selective in that the adjectives "faithful", "pure" and "duly" have been added to the description of the Church as "visible congregation" (which is not meant to be taken in the narrow sense of the local ecclesial unit). We ought not to be surprized at the description of the Church in the Articles, nor ought we to be too easily misled by it. The Articles have a distinct partisan and polemical spirit, as indeed do the pronouncements of other groups of Christians which were issued in the same troubled period. The point to be borne in mind here, however, is not that the kind of statement which we have found in the Articles somehow binds anglican thinking to a precise position there expounded, but rather that it is necessary to look at the Articles in the light of the period in which they were written in order to understand what it is that they, in fact, have to say of lasting value for the Church. Thus, in this instance, it is important to note that there is no essential difference between the position taken in the Second Office, and that taken in the Article. The apparent difference resides in the use of largely functional language to describe the Church in the latter case, while largely ontological language is used in the former.

Both of these statements attest to the fact that the Church is a Body or a Congregation. In some sense it is of the essence of the Church that it is one. There cannot,

in the nature of things, be two bodies which each are the Church. How, then, does this fit in with the obvious fact that there are indeed a large number of Christian communities which are not in formal communion with each other? The Prayer Book's answer is that one is made a Christian, a member of the one Body, through Baptism. The position which it takes is an inclusive one; it is comprehensive. Within the one Body of Christ, it makes room for those from whom one is, in fact, separated as a Christian.

The alternative to such an interpretation of the manner in which separated Christians can belong to the one Body is, of course, to say that they cannot. If one is not a member of our visible, institutionalized church, he is not a member of the Church which is the Body of Christ. This is a "true Church" position. It asserts that those who are not formally members with us are not Christians. We can be grateful that we do not have this understanding as a part of our anglican heritage. Rather, anglicans have clearly taken the position that the Body of Christ is that community of which Christ is the Head, and all baptized persons are the members.

As a theological statement, this position recommends itself. But, how are we to visualize the Church thus described when it appears that there is no institutional entity which comprehends all Christians? The simple facts of life are that we see around us a number of communities which claim to be the Church, and which are exclusive one of the other. Moreover, we cannot really even look back to some golden

age in the history of the world and say that there the oneness of the Church is evident. For whereas at certain times in the history of the Church it is true that there was more general agreement about Christian doctrine and polity than might be expressed today, it is also a fact that distance and language was even then a barrier which effectively separated Christians. Even earlier, it is clear from the New Testament witnesses that in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods there were divisions and competitions within the Church.<sup>5</sup> How, then, are we to say that the Church is one Body?

We might say that the Church is one Body in a directly spiritual sense. That would be to assert that there exists something called the Body of Christ which is the Church, and which has its true expression only on an ontological level which transcends the ontological level on which our institutional structures exist. Under such an understanding, even if all Christians were formed into one institutional structure, they would still not thereby be members of the Church which is the Body of Christ, because that Body of Christ is located on a different level of existence. Such a position is possible for Christians. Indeed, there is some apparent support for it, for how else are we to envision our community with those who have died before us in the Faith, and with those who are yet to come?

Were we to postulate the existence of the Church as



the Body of Christ on a distinct ontological level from that upon which we exist, we would, however, be making the most serious of errors. We would be saying that in some sense the Church as we know it is only a phantasm; that it is something which is perceived only as an object of faith. Such a position opens the way to myriad misunderstandings of the Christian life, and of the mission of Christians to the world. In the first place, it would be to affirm that the Christian's life in the world is, indeed, just the same as the non-Christian's. Being a Christian would at best mean that one was a member of a community which had its real existence outside of the world as it is known. Implied would be a real lack of certainty as to the characteristics of this other-worldly Church, with the result that in the end the Christian would be left on his own to make the most that he could of his secular life. In addition, it would mean that the important issues of the Christian life were always to be decided on the level of the other-worldly, that is, of the "unreal". Sin, for example, would fundamentally be a matter for the other world, not for this one, and therefore, the forgiveness of sins would always have to be relegated to the sphere of faith, with the result that the Christian could never actually be sure that his confession of sin was accepted. Moreover, such a position would make it possible for the divisions and the party-spirit which has at times enveloped the Church to justify itself. Who, after all, could be sure that his understanding of the

faith was anything like in accord with the Divine Will?

But perhaps most serious of the ramifications which such an other-worldly concept of the Church would permit is the essential down-grading of the nature of creation. Such a position would lodge its hope for the future in the release from worldly situations. This might be good Buddhism; it is hardly good Christianity. For, indeed, it is central to the Christian Faith that the Word became flesh; that the Incarnation took place. What has happened in the world is that God has come to dwell with us as man, and that in the Resurrection from the dead the manhood which He assumed at His Incarnation has been eternally coopted into the Godhead itself, so that it can be said even now that the God-man is reigning on the throne of God in heaven. Such is the Christian message. It proclaims that the creation which we know in our day to day lives is essentially good, and that it is essentially important to our salvation. Our human nature is not something which we are to shed at some future time in order to partake of the heavenly kingdom, rather it is the very fabric out of which our eternal enjoyment of the Godhead is to be fashioned. Thus, it is implicit in the Christian message that the nature of the Christian life must be understandable and explainable in terms of our here and now existence. The Church, the Body of which Christ is the Head and all baptized persons are members, is something which really exists in the order of creation, and not solely in some other order which we can only perceive by faith.

Still, we must face the fact that it seems that the Church simply does not exist today in the fashion which is intended by the theological statement that it is the Body of Christ, of which all baptized persons are members. There does not appear to be any institution which fullfills these requirements. The only way out of this problem would seem to be to affirm that the "right" position to hold is that there are some ecclesial institutions which are the Church, and that there are others which are not. It seems that we must define what the "true" Church is.

There is, however, another way out of this problem. In the first place, we have to investigate what it is that we mean when we say that the Church is the Body of Christ. Surely Christ cannot be divided in such a fashion that there are a plurality of Christ's Body. Yet we have asserted that it is cooption into Christ's Body which occurs at Baptism. By Baptism we also recognize that we are grafted into different ecclesial entities. Are we not then forced to postulate a plurality of Christ's Body? The problem resides in the understanding of the Body into which it is that we are grafted by Baptism. It is not an institutional, ecclesial body in the first instance, although it is always that as well. In the first instance it is a grafting into the People of God. It is Christ's People that we are made at Baptism. The concept of a "People" does not require the kind of institutional framework which seems to be presupposed by the concept "Church". A People can be called out of many nations, for example.

Yet it is surely as a People that the Old Testament describes the Israelites, and it is as unto a People that the New Testament sets forth the coming of the Kingdom of God. God calls men to be His People, not simply members of a given institution. This is not to say that the People of God do not have to have some kind of institutional structure. They do, and this will be a subject for later discussion. It is sufficient at the moment to remember that the prime calling of Christians is to be the People of God, and to exist as His People in the world.

When we refer to the People of God, our first frame of reference is not an institutional one, at least in the usual sense. It is possible, for example, to consider those who by their Baptism are grafted into Christ as His People, without at all facing the question as to in what manner this People represents any of the extant ecclesial communities which might be termed the Church. What we discover, then, is that the People of God is a prime reality. It is something to which we belong by our Baptism. We are not, therefore, first and foremost Anglicans, or Roman Catholics or Protestants, but we are members of the People of God. Here is a concept which is not necessarily identified with any existing "church". While the baptized members of the existing churches are, in fact, members of the People of God, it is not the prerogative of any given ecclesial unit to claim that it is the sole community of the People of God.

The People of God is an ontological "fact" which satisfies the requirements of the anglican formularies we have noted. The People of God is, as it were, the Body of Christ of which He is the Head and all baptized persons are members. This People can exist in many forms and in many places. It can include those who have gone before, those who now live, and those who are yet to come. Herein lies the distinction between the Church as it has been understood in conventional manual theology, and the Church as it might be re-conceived today. In the past it has been usual to consider the People of God as they might first be members of the Church, howsoever that membership might be defined. Today we are suggesting that Christians are to be considered first as People of God, and only secondly as members of a "church".

But if the People of God is the prime reality, just how is it that the Church is related to this reality? "The Church" is apparently a time-space reality. So is the People of God. Further, membership in the People of God seems to presuppose some membership in a community which calls itself the Church. Indeed, it would be false to suggest that we know of any way of belonging to the People of God which does not also include membership in the "Church". All that is suggested here is that membership as one of the People of God is theologically and phenomenologically prior to membership in the Church as we know it as a human institution.

At stake in this distinction is a concern for showing

that the creation as we know it, and the world in which we live, are real things which God has given us to deal with. They are not phantasms, nor is the Church something other than the things which we know in our everyday lives. The course of salvation history as it has been and is to be worked out among men is one which has its locus in the first instance in the kind of world which we know as our world. Membership in the Church, then, is not something which is not understandable and describable in the world in which we live, and in which we are called to show forth Christ to all men. This is ultimately to say that the "Church" and the People of God which it presupposes are realities which exist on the natural level of existence, even though they may also exist on other levels of existence. The People of God is a people which can be isolated here and now. They are those who have been baptized into the Lord Jesus, and whose duty it is to show forth the Lord's death 'til He come.

But to say this is to say something radically different from saying that the Christian is first a member of the "Church", and second a member of the People of God. To be sure, in one sense the terms "Church" and "People of God" can be used equivalently. A major problem with this usage is, however, that the history of our pilgrimage to this point has been to obscure the meaning of the word "Church" to the point that some Christians could say that other Christians were not members of it. While in a secular, institutional sense such may well be the truth, the point

which is here being stressed is that all the while these same "other" people were members of the People of God, and membership in that Body is the prime reality for Christians.

At this point it becomes necessary to change our vocabulary. We have been using the word "Church" as it might have been used in traditional Christian usage. Such is, however, no longer the case. The word "Church" is not further to be used to refer to a particular institutional embodiment of the People of God. Rather, we would prefer that such institutions be referred to as "ecclesial communities" or as sub-divisions of the People of God.<sup>6</sup> This is necessary because the term "the Church" must be recovered for legitimate use by Christians. It is quite a proper term to use for the whole People of God. Such a usage is both ancient and forward-looking since it embodies the aspirations for the unity of Christians which the concept of the People of God claims even now to be a reality.

How, then, can "the Church" be defined so as to make it a viable concept in juxtaposition to the institutional usages of the word which now exist? Karl Rahner has suggested that the Church can be understood as the "eschatologically triumphant community of grace".<sup>7</sup> It is simply God's|People, now. The Church is simply the Body of Christ of which all baptized persons are members. We find ourselves, thus, back again at the definition of the Church which was given in the Second Office of Instruction. But we are returned with a difference. We are no longer saying that the Church which

is the Body of Christ is a community which we know directly as an institution in our world of institutions, but rather that the Church is the Body of Christ in the sense that it is the People of God. It is all those coopted into Christ<sup>8</sup> by their Baptism. As such, the Church is also a prime reality for Christians. It is that into which they have been coopted and grafted. More, it is that community of God's People in which the grace of God is made real for them. It is that community in which the sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit is present. It is that community which is universal, for all men at all times, everywhere. It is, in some effective sense, the triumphant future, here and now.

In saying that the Church is the Body of Christ, and that it is the People of God, we continue to affirm that it is a reality which exists in our space-time dimension, and that it is not something which exists only in another order of reality. Thus, somehow in the collection of "churches" which surround the average American town green there exists even now the Church, the People of God. In saying this, the first thing which comes to mind is that the Church, still, evidently is not one, at least not on the public, visible level. Are there not several separate "churches"? Such would appear to be the case. We must remember, however, that the definition of the Church as the People of God somehow transcends all of the separations in and among Christians, and despite them somehow, even now



unites Christians into the one Body of Christ. This united, one reality already exists in the natural sphere. This is the beginning point from which we have to operate, namely that the People of God already exists, and that even in its divisions it is already "visible".

Thus, whether we discuss the Church as Anglicans, or as Roman Catholics, or Orthodox, or Protestants we will always be talking, each in our own way, about the further making "visible" of the People of God in a particular form and at a particular time and place. At the same time that we are concerned with the making "visible" of the People of God, we must also bear in mind that in making them visible it is indeed the Body of Christ itself which is made visible, and that it is cooption into this Body which is the desired end willed by God for all men. The Church, the People of God, the Body of Christ, visible now amidst the divisions which separate Christians is the community of those who have been made God's People by having been coopted into Him in the Person of His Son. Thus it is that the People of God already show forth the Body of Christ. For this People has its current unity and its current reality in the fact that it is the Body of Christ. Christ's Body is not a reality which is no longer existent upon the level of reality with which we operate. It is not as though with Christ's death and Resurrection He ceased to exist upon the ontological level on which we live. Indeed, it is the mystery of the Church that it is the continuation of the Body of Christ

through time and space. The men and women grafted into the Body of Christ by Baptism are really and truly, now, members in the very Body of Christ which is their home, and within which their sanctification is to come to fruition. The assertion that Christ's Body is present as the eschatological community of His People right here and now is a radical affirmation of the human nature which Our Lord assumed at the Incarnation, and which He carried through His Passion and Death to His Ascension at the Right Hand of the Father. It is an affirmation that the lives which men live today are not phantasms, and are not mere shadows of a real life which is to be lived elsewhere and at another time. The Christian is not "born anew" after death; there is no new beginning, but rather the completion and fulfillment of a process of sanctification which has had its beginnings in his Baptism. Whatever a Christian shall be is potentially present in what he becomes at his Baptism; what he shall be is one with Christ, and one who reigns with Christ. In his Baptism, the Christian has already become these things in potentiality. The People of God are now the visibility of the Body of Christ in the world. Christ is among us because the People of God exist among us. The Church, which is the Body of Christ, exists because the People of God by whom she is constituted exist. It is in this way that the future of God for men is made "visible".

We must needs spend a little more time on the  
 9  
 concept of the visibility of the Body of Christ. In using

the term "visible" it is intended to describe the fact that the Body of Christ is made real, tangible, actual, manifest and present in the world. The manner in which it is made "visible", and the forms which this visibility may take, will be dealt with later. For the moment, however, it is enough to assert that the Body of Christ becomes visible in the world in which men live. The real world as we know it exists on a level of existence upon which the Body of Christ also exists. The word "visible" is chosen in this context because we also want to affirm that the Body of Christ exists on all levels of existence. (Indeed, this is the point of the doctrine of the harrowing of Hell.) There is no conceivable level of existence, no ontological state, in which the Body of Christ does not exist. But the word "visible" is appropriate because on our level of existence the Body of Christ is not a self-evident, objective reality. It is only known as it is composed of men and women who have been coopted into it. It is made visible in them.

At the same time, the Body of Christ is made visible through a system of signs and symbols. By a sign or symbol is meant an objective reality which carries with it a manifestation of the Body of Christ. A sign is thus a means whereby the distance between ontological levels is bridged. What is a real act in this level of existence serves as a sign for a correspondingly real act on the level of existence at which the Godhead dwells in Its fullness. Thus,

for example, in the rite of Baptism a person is washed with water and received into the "congregation of Christ's flock" in the Name of the Trinity. This ritual action is a sign of the reality which is taking place, namely, that thereby the person baptized is coopted into the life of Christ as it is from eternity, and thus is made one with the Father in heaven. In objective terms, the sign or symbol mediates between two ontological levels. It is what it symbolizes. So in the Eucharist, we re-present the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and claim anew the benefits of grace which are promised us thereby. We solemnly re-actualize the Lord's blessing of bread and wine, thereby repeating the sign whose content is that these elements become the Body and Blood of Christ. By the performance of the sign an effectual bridge is constituted, and the elements which we have offered on that occasion become the Body and Blood of Christ for the reason that the sign partakes of that which it symbolizes. Thus, through a system of signs the Body of Christ becomes manifest or visible.

At this point there appear to be at least two modes in which the Body of Christ becomes visible. First, in the People who have become the People of God. Second, through a system of signs or symbols. There are not, however, in reality two modes represented here. The Body of Christ becomes visible in God's People through the sacramental signs. The latter are to be seen as the means whereby the former is constituted, and not as a reality wholly independent and

and existent by themselves. The sign value of a sign can be extinguished, for example, by the effective disappearance  
 11  
 of the sign.

While the signs whereby Christ's Body becomes visible are constitutive of His People, it is within His People that the signs are effected. A two-way relationship is therefore present. On the one hand, the People of God is nourished by the sacred signs, and at the same time, it is the forum in which they take place. The fact that the sacred signs take place among the People of God is not, in the first instance, because it is there that they must take place in some preceptive sense. Rather, by the very fact that they take place, to that degree they constitute the People in the midst of whom they occur. The importance of this understanding for the Church is obvious. Only thus can the older concepts of the institutional Church and its "valid" sacraments be renewed. The understanding of the fashion in which the Body of Christ is made visible for the salvation of men needs to be rethought so as to accept the fact that the People of God are the visibility of the Body of Christ within which, by the celebration of their sacred signs, the Body of Christ, thus made visible, is both constituted and nourished.

To say that the Body of Christ is constituted by these sacred signs is to recognize that it is initially a result of the sign of Baptism. Thus, it will be noted, the visibility of Christ's Body transcends a plurality of ecclesial institutions. But this insight raises a major problem for

the Christian. If the Body of Christ is constituted by the sign of Baptism, what is he to make of the fact that there are a number of distinct ecclesial communities extant in the world which he knows? It is to overcome this divided situation, and the tension which it rightly produces in the conscience of the Christian, that the ecumenical movement has come into being. In its very existence there is tacit recognition that there is something radically wrong with an understanding of the Church which has room within it for the fact of separated Christians whose separation is not simply a matter of a permitted difference of expression, but rather represents a fundamental exclusion of the other. Separation which so excludes the baptized other from acceptance as a member of the Body of Christ is clearly a misunderstanding of the nature of the Body of Christ. Separation, therefore, when it is exclusive, definitive and allegedly determinative of Christian "membership" is a sin against the Body of which it is purported that one is a member by Baptism.

In a renewed understanding of the Church it will be necessary to begin, then, with the affirmation that the fact of one's Baptism indicates initiation into the Body of Christ, which is the prime reality of the Christian life. Thus, whoever is a member of a current ecclesial community is forced to view his membership in the Church as primarily the result of his Baptism, and not the result of his "joining" the particular ecclesial community. The sign which effects and constitutes membership in the Church, the People of God,

is that of Baptism. The sign which completes the rite of initiation, and effectualizes the gift of the Holy Spirit in its fullness is that of Confirmation. The sign which above all signifies the unity of the Body and nourishes its members is that of the Eucharist. The sign which restores to membership those who by their acts against the Body have repudiated at least a portion of their membership is that of the Forgiveness of Sins. The sign which effects between a couple the reality of a marriage within the Body of Christ is that of Holy Matrimony. So too, the sign which effects a total encounter of the person with the power of Christ's Body and its healing force is that of the Anointing of the Sick. Lastly, the sign which coopts one into the Priesthood of Christ in such a way as to constitute one a priest for the People of God on their pilgrimage is that of Holy Orders.

Each of these signs represents an encounter with Christ, and therefore with the fullness of the Godhead, which is directed toward the sanctification of the person who is designated as the recipient of the sign's grace. The sign makes visible the Body of Christ in encounter with those who are its recipients. But each of these signs must necessarily follow after the sign of Baptism, as far as the individual is concerned. Cooptation into the Body of Christ is the first step. In point of fact, the sign of the Eucharist is that one which is most often encountered since it is intended for the normal and regular building up, or making manifest, of the Body of Christ. Indeed, the Eucharist is the principal sign

of the Body of Christ because it both proclaims and makes manifest the unity of the Body which takes place at its celebration. But even the Eucharist must presuppose Baptism.

A principal issue, then, in a day when ecclesial communities are in fact separated one from the other is, "To what extent can the sacramental signs exist in these separated bodies?" We have seen how the sign of Baptism is constitutive of the Body of Christ, and that the members of the several separated ecclesial bodies share their common belonging to the Body of Christ by reason of their reception of the sign of Baptism. The issue remains, however, whether the other sacred signs are also present in the Body of Christ thus constituted in separation. The classical argument which surrounds this issue relates to the claimed necessary inter-connection between the sign of Holy Orders and the remaining signs of the Body of Christ. To be sure, an exception is made in the case of Matrimony on the theory that the ministers of the sign are the couple themselves, and thus Holy Orders are said not to be involved.<sup>13</sup> A second exception has been made in rare cases relating to the sign of Baptism itself<sup>14</sup> where the minister of the sign is not a Christian. Any argument of this sort, however, which makes Baptism a mechanical sign, performable by anyone because it confers grace irrespective of the status of its minister, should be rejected as a denial of the necessity to celebrate the sign within the community of the People of God. In rare cases, however, it might be held that whereas all religions and all



men are enlightened by the grace of Christ insofar as they are in any ways enlightened, therefore, when a pagan administers the rite of Baptism, an enlightened act, it must be held that to that extent Christ's grace in him has effected, at least for the time necessary, a presence of the Body of Christ.

But in the case of Baptism another exception to the requirement that the minister of the sign must be in Holy Orders has been made, even by the most rigid classical sacramentalists. That is, that Baptism by water and in the Name of the Trinity is valid when performed by any Christian. Holy Orders, as commonly understood, are not claimed to be necessary. This position must be expanded upon. Does it, for example, mean that Holy Orders can somehow be seen as a continuum, something inherent in the membership of anyone in the Body of Christ, and which, at least for some purposes, such as Baptism, are sufficiently actualized by Baptism alone to be effective? Such would seem to be a necessary result of the acceptance of "lay" baptisms.

From this example of the case of Baptism we are forced to examine the sign of Holy Orders further. Traditionally this sign has been seen as necessary to the visibility of the Church, and as the perfection of Christ's Priesthood in it. The argument is that the Church is the institutionalization of God's salvific Will for men, and that it must of the nature of things include an heirarchical cast for the administration of the rites whereby God's saving grace is

mediated to men. Such, indeed, is the implication of the Preface to the anglican Ordinal, where it is stated that:

"...from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and

Deacons."<sup>15</sup> The ministry of Christ to men has been seen as carried out by the ministry of those ordered in the Church. In the development of this concept it has been seen as vital that the minister of the Church be "in apostolic succession", which is to say that his authorization to act as a minister of Christ must have been received by the laying-on-of-hands from one who stood, as Bishop, in direct (tactile) succession to the Apostles.

The divisions among Christians have caused a major problem in this area. It can take two forms. In the first it may be asserted that the "break" of a given Christian Body from the whole for the time being has resulted in a juridical break, but has not effected the "validity" of the Holy Orders existing in the new community. In the second case it is argued that the "break" has destroyed the "validity" of the Holy Orders in the now-separated community, as for example by a failure in tactile succession, with the result that the separated community has ceased to be a part of Christ's Body. Indeed, the traditional argument about anglican Orders focuses about these two possible positions. Anglicans claim to fall under the first of the two described cases. Roman Catholics and others have claimed that the anglican situation falls under the second case. Thus, it

is claimed, anglican Orders are invalid, and therefore, anglican sacraments are not sacraments at all.

Such is one traditional manner of viewing the problem of anglican Orders. It is suggested here, however, that the understanding of the Church which we have developed will not fit either of the two traditional ways of looking at the question of the validity of Orders. The fact of Baptism, in this case the baptism of anglicans (although any other separated Christian community could be substituted), alone establishes the Body of Christ present. In some real sense the ecclesial community to which anglicans give allegiance, is the Church, the prime reality for Christians. Further, the traditional analysis of divisions in the Body of Christ which sees them as "breaks" away from some prior ecclesial unity often does not fit the facts. In some cases movements emerged out of, and were not comprehended by, existing ecclesial units. Such might be seen to be the case in the Methodist "break" with the Church of England. In other cases, the break with the prior ecclesial community was due to the emergence of a national unit in opposition to a pre-existing international unit. Thus both Lutheran and Anglican "breaks" could be viewed. The emergence of sub-units within a prior ecclesial unity has, as a phenomenon, usually, if not always, had coupled with it the ascendancy of a particular form of teaching which is recognized as "deviant" in some essential way by the prior community. The essential interconnection between the emergence of non-comprehended ecclesial sub-units

and the ascendancy of some particular "heresy" is not as clearly seen today as it has been in times past. This is properly the case. The passage of time has shown that in most every case, whereas a particular deviant opinion may ~~have~~ been accepted by even major portions of the separated community at, or just after, the time of separation, this opinion tends to be discarded with time. This "sluffing off" of various positions tends to eliminate those which have been stated too strongly ~~under~~ the pressures of the times. Such is the witness of the current ecumenical movement. Still, the reconciliation of separated Christian communities has proved to be a most difficult job for the "churches".

Underlying all the divisions in the Body of Christ are two things. First, there is the Body of Christ, which is the Church, the prime reality for Christians. Second, there is sin, shared by all sides, which is manifest in the failure of those in times past, and those today, who have not recognized that the visible unity of Christ's Body, plainly showed, is ultimately more important to its mission, which is the salvation of men, than are the difficulties of being the Church in the face of emergent nationalism, or in the face of hard theological controversy.

As we try in our day to work for the reunion of the Body of Christ, which is to say, the maximalization of its visibility, we must consider anew the questions as to whether separated Christians can and do possess the sacramental signs which go hand in hand with the visibility of the

Body of Christ. We recognize that all communities formed by Baptism are somehow the visibility of Christ's Body, and that the Holy Spirit can be seen to have been at work in each of them. We are left, then, to investigate how the sign of Holy Orders is necessary to the Body of Christ in its being made visible through its sacred signs. Especially is this necessary in the case of separated Christians who claim, as in the case of anglicans, to have continued the sacramental signs whereby the Body of Christ is constituted, re-constituted and nourished, and where these communities have claimed to have celebrated these sacramental signs through the office of a priesthood set forth as the result of the celebration of the sign of Holy Orders, whereby the Priesthood of Christ is made effective for the People of God.

### Chapter Three:

#### The Sign of Holy Orders

We have suggested in the last Chapter that the Body of Christ is made visible and manifest through a system of sacramental signs. These signs both nourish and constitute the People of God, the Church, which is the prime reality for Christians. We must now direct our attention to the sign of Holy Orders in order to investigate the fashion in which the Body of Christ is made visible through the operation of this sign.

Holy Orders is the sign of Christ's Priesthood. Christ's Priesthood is that aspect of His Being whereby He stands between God and man, as the God-man, and mediates the Father's love toward men, as is most precisely demonstrated by His sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross. The aspect of Christ's nature which we call His Priesthood is precisely, then, that portion of His activity in which He intercedes before the throne of God for men, and in which He dispenses and mediates to them the riches of God's gifts for them. It should be noted that Christ's function as Priest is not incidental to the rest of His work, rather, Christ's Priesthood is an essential aspect of the activity of the God-man which flows primarily from the fact of the union of divine and human natures in His single person. For it is precisely in the arch-type of that union that

we humans perceive the promise of our absolute future, the total cooption of our humanity into the reality of the Divine Life.

Since, then, Christ's Priesthood is an essential aspect of His work, it will be present wherever His Body is visible -- whenever and wherever the People of God are. But we have seen that the People of God is a reality which is fundamentally constituted by the sign of Baptism. Thus, the reality or visibility of Christ's Priesthood must be in some sense apparent in Baptism itself. Baptism is the sign whereby one who was estranged from God is effectively caught up into the divine life and grafted into God's People, which is the visibility of the Body of Christ in this age. It is thus fundamental to any concept of the priesthood among the People of God to recognize that every Christian, by virtue of his Baptism, already participates in Christ's Priesthood. The manner in which this participation is expressed might perhaps best be termed "inherent" or "potential". This in no sense means that the participation in Christ's Priesthood is not real or effectual. Rather, the baptized person participates in Christ's Priesthood precisely to the degree which is appropriate to his function as a member of the People of God. While we affirm that by Divine command there has been "...from the Apostles' time these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests<sup>1</sup> and Deacons", the presence of certain members of the People of God charged with special ministerial functions does not

deny the reality that through Baptism the individual member of the People of God shares in Christ's Priesthood. Indeed, quite the contrary. The individual Christian already possesses by virtue of his Baptism that participation in Christ's Priesthood which is more visibly displayed by the existence of the ordained ministry. Indeed, the ordained ministry can be seen as but an intensification of that Priesthood of Christ toward His People which is potential and inherent in each baptized member of the People of God.

It is on the basis of such an analysis of the manner in which Christ's Priesthood is made visible for His People that the possibility of lay baptism can be understood. The reason that a lay member of the People of God can effectively minister the sign of Baptism is not because of some extraordinary dispensation of the Priesthood of Christ, but rather, because baptizing is a function of the Priesthood of Christ which is wholly appropriate to the lay person's participation in Christ's Priesthood by virtue of his own Baptism. The power to act effectively for Christ in the initial sign which constitutes its recipient a member of Christ's People is, by virtue of the divine economy which wills to coopt all men into itself, present in that degree of intensification of Christ's Priesthood which is common to all of God's People by virtue of their Baptism. More precisely, then, such baptism ought not to be termed "lay" baptism, but rather, baptism ministered by one who is an un-ordained Priest. The fact that ecclesial communities



generally look upon lay baptism as permissible primarily in emergency situations should be seen as the result both of the institutionalization of the sign of Baptism, and of the availability in the historic Church of sufficient ordained ministers to regularly perform the baptism of converts. In looking for ways of renewal, the institutional Church might well consider the possibility of regularly causing Baptisms to be performed by un-ordained Christians in order to underscore the extent of their effective participation in Christ's Priesthood.

In addition to the case of "lay" baptism, the special nature of the sign of Holy Matrimony must also be considered. It is generally agreed that the ministers of the sign of Matrimony are the couple themselves, rather than an ordained minister who may be present at the rite.<sup>2</sup> It is true that in some instances the "validity" of the marriage may not be recognized by the institutional Church unless it has been performed in the presence of an ordained minister. The principle that the couple themselves are the ministers of the sign is not violated, however. While it can be argued that the reason for considering the couple as the ministers of the sign is due to the nature of the sign of Matrimony, namely that it is a contract in which mutual promises are exchanged, it is suggested here that the understanding that the ministers are the couple has a more profound significance. The ministers are the couple precisely because, like Baptism, this sign requires a degree of priesthood for its celebration which is

well within the priesthood inherent in the baptismal status of the couple.<sup>3</sup> Again, it is suggested that the general availability of ordained ministers, in combination with the desire of the Church to regulate marriages within the People of God, and the fact that secular law usually only recognizes marriages performed before a legal officer of the state (such as a priest deputized for the purpose) has caused Christians to sometimes confuse the acquiring of secular legal status and the performance of the sign of Matrimony.

We come now to consider the fashion in which the reception of Holy Orders is related to the Priesthood of Christ, and in particular how it is related to the inherent participation in Christ's Priesthood which is common to all baptized Christians. At this stage of our investigations the phrase "Holy Orders" is intended to refer to the three levels or ranks of the ordained ministry, namely: deacon, priest and bishop. We shall want later to investigate the distinction between these three levels, but such differentiation is not necessary for the current discussion.

If it can be admitted that from "the Apostles' time" there have been these three-fold orders of ministry in the Church, the issue still remains whether assumption and performance of one of these ministerial offices involves any essential change in respect of the position of the officeholder vis-a-vis the rest of the People of God. It can be argued that any Christian may act as a minister to the

People of God, in which case his or her ordination would reflect simply the recognition that the individual was a legitimate officeholder within the community of Christians. Ordination would be a sign of community assent.

On the other hand, we may accept the view that the levels of the ordained ministry represent not merely the selection of one of a number of peers to perform an office within the community, but more, that they represent in some effective sense a change in status and in essence for the person ordained. This is what has been historically intended in asserting that Holy Orders is a sacrament.

We have argued, however, that by Baptism the Christian participates in the Priesthood of Christ. We must, then, investigate the fashion in which the ordained ministry participates in Christ's Priesthood, and whether its participation differs from that of the non-ordained Christian. While the participation of the baptized person in the Priesthood of Christ is effective, we have suggested that it is "inherent" and that it is possible to "intensify" its degree of participation. We can, then, suggest that the sign of Holy Orders is precisely such an intensification of the participation of the baptized person in Christ's Priesthood. Indeed, as we shall see below, the ordained minister historically exercises certain of Christ's priestly functions which are not normally exercised by the un-ordained Christian. Examples of such are the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the pronouncing of God's absolution of sin and the specification

of Christ's blessings. The issue to be considered is whether Holy Orders is a sign which admits the recipient to a greater perfection in the Priesthood of Christ. It would seem that such were evidently the case, since the Church has historically maintained that only those of its members who have received the sign of Holy Orders may exercise those elements of Christ's Priesthood which are not generally exercised by those Christians whose participation in Christ's Priesthood is limited to that acquired through their Baptism. But if reception of the sign of Holy Orders admits the recipient to an intensified participation in Christ's Priesthood, it must follow that the sign of Holy Orders is technically a sacrament or sacramental sign whereby the recipient is actually granted by Christ that necessary additional participation in His priestly powers. The apparent transmission of these priestly powers by means of a ritual which has historically claimed to do so must correspond with an actual delegation of such powers by Christ for the sake of His People. The person ordained must then be the recipient of some element of grace, since a sacramental sign is a means whereby grace is transmitted. The grace which is received takes the form of a further cooption of the ordained person into the life of Christ, and an intensification of Christ's holiness in him for the performance of Christ's Priesthood to His People.

In the same fashion, the "character" conferred by Holy Orders is indelible; once it has been conferred it is not possible for the recipient to renounce it effectively.

Such an indelible character is the result of the transmission of grace which takes place in conjunction with the performance of the sacramental sign. The character is indelible precisely because by the reception of this grace the recipient has been granted an intensified share in Christ's Priesthood. While he may fail in his stewardship of this heightened participation in Christ's Priesthood, it is no longer within the power of the recipient to renounce that intensification which has objectively taken place in him. As with Baptism/Confirmation, the reception of the grace of this sign has caused a form of ontological change in the person of the recipient.

An interesting aspect of the intensification of Christ's Priesthood in the recipient of the sign of Holy Orders is the possibility that this intensification might be potentially complete at the time of the performance of the sacramental sign, while still remaining open to actualization in its fullness at a subsequent time in the life of the recipient. Such a possibility seems to be required as a result of the manner in which grace is transmitted to the recipient of any sacramental sign. Preeminently, such is the case with the sign of Baptism applied to infants. In such a situation, the grace of the sacrament is said to operate actually in the infant from the time of performance of the rite. If, however, the sign is not to be considered magical it must presuppose some active response by the recipient to appropriate the grace offered in the sacrament. Thus, the Church has

historically provided God-parents to witness to the potential acceptance of the infant. So too, in connection with the sacrament of Penance it has been held that sins for which the penitent is not truly sorry are nonetheless absolved by virtue of the performance of the sacrament if, at a later time, the penitent does become truly sorry for the particular sins involved.<sup>4</sup> The principle involved is that while the grace of a sacramental sign is transmitted in its fullness by the performance of the rite, it is possible that a portion of the sign's grace is only transmitted in potentia.

Since the effect of a sacramental sign is to provide an encounter between Christ and the individual, it is at least theoretically possible that the individual will not fully appropriate the dimensions of the encounter, and will be prepared at the time to accept only a portion of the grace which is offered in the encounter. This does not mean that failure to enter completely into the mystery of the particular encounter with Christ somehow destroys the validity of the sign. Nor can an innocent failure on the part of the individual prevent the grace of Christ from operating. Thus, in every sacramental encounter it is possible, if not likely, that some portion of the grace offered in the encounter is not appropriated by the individual. The entirety of grace is, however, offered, as indeed God's saving grace is continually offered to His People. Therefore, if at a later time the individual reflects upon the earlier encounter with Christ in the sacramental sign involved, and recognizes

that grace was offered, but not appropriated, he is free to make a decision to appropriate then and there the fullness of grace which had been offered in the prior encounter. It may be more convenient to refer to this after-acquisition of grace as an appropriation of the fullness of the particular sign involved.

On the basis of an understanding of this sort, we can perceive that the sign of Holy Orders is a sacramental encounter with Christ in which the sharing in Christ's Priesthood which is inherent in Baptism is intensified, or perfected, by the transmission of new grace to the individual. The "character" which is the result of this encounter is indelible in the sense that the encounter with Christ having occurred, it cannot later be said that it did not. Further, in this encounter, it is at least possible for the individual to intend to receive a lesser fullness of Christ's Priesthood than is being offered. (It is on the basis of these understandings that separated ministries may both be recognized as "valid", and may also be reconciled.)

In discussing the sign of Holy Orders, however, we must distinguish between the office in the Church to which the reception of Holy Orders admits an individual and the "jurisdiction" which is coupled with the holding of that office. Jurisdiction is a technical term which generally refers to the fact that a minister is ordained to serve a discrete portion of God's People. Jurisdiction is often geographically defined. We say that X is the bishop of

some particular diocese, or that Y is the priest of a certain parish. Jurisdiction in this sense is not essential to Holy Orders. There is one exception to this understanding of jurisdiction, namely that jurisdiction may be inherent in function, or office. Thus, a Bishop presiding at the Eucharist, or a Priest presiding in his place, by the very fact of his presiding (his function) acquires a certain degree of jurisdiction to admit or not admit members of the congregation to receive Holy Communion. So too, the Priest in the Confessional, or at the sick bed, or baptizing, necessarily "takes" jurisdiction of the individual involved in the performance of that particular sign. This understanding of jurisdiction is not, however, the traditional concept common to canon law. The legal concept of jurisdiction is not inherent in or essential to Holy Orders, but rather represents a governmental function which has been added by tradition to the performance of the office to which Holy Orders admits. Sufficient time has now passed since the institution of Holy Orders in the Church that it is generally considered to be impossible to confer Holy Orders without coupling some particular jurisdiction. Thus, in the Roman Church, it is customary to consecrate bishops to titular dioceses to fullfill the requirements of jurisdiction.<sup>5</sup> So too, in the Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America a man may not be ordained to the Priesthood until he has the promise<sup>6</sup> of some kind of parochial jurisdiction. It is important to note, however, that these current restrictions are the



product of a long history of development, and are not necessarily essential to the office to which the individual is admitted by Holy Orders. Indeed, this fact is specifically affirmed in cases of the deposition of a Priest or Bishop, wherein he may be stripped of his jurisdiction, and therefore denied permission to function in his office, while at the same time it is affirmed that the "character" of his Orders is indelible and may not be taken away from him.

It is, however, the office or function which defines the extent of participation in the fullness of Christ's Priesthood which is granted to a particular individual. Insofar as the offices of deacon, priest and bishop are differentiated, office or function becomes important. It is to an office in the Church that a person is ordained, and it is the function of that office which specifies the participation in Christ's Priesthood which is granted by the rite of ordination.

Where the office is the priesthood a number of elements of participation in Christ's Priesthood are involved. First is the power to represent Christ in the eucharistic assembly, and there to offer Christ's eucharistic sacrifice. This is the primary power of representing Christ to His People, and in turn of representing them before the throne of God. Indeed, this power of representation is perhaps the most generalized and most central of Christ's priestly powers which the ordained ministry exercises. The relationship between priest and bishop is also here involved since every

bishop is first a priest, and every priest is but a representative of his bishop. From one point of view we affirm that the jurisdiction of a priest presiding at the Eucharist is not his but his bishop's; as President of the Eucharist he is "standing in" for the bishop. From a different perspective we want to say that the President of the eucharistic assembly is always Christ, and that the office of Presidency represents Christ's presidency. From this point of view, the priestly function takes precedence over jurisdiction. The potential difference between these two approaches is effectively avoided in the end by assigning the jurisdiction of presidency to the bishop, while claiming that his performance of his presidency is representational.

In addition to the power to represent Christ, the power to judge for Christ is also one of the elements of Christ's Priesthood to which the office of priest admits the individual. The power to judge for Christ is realized in the priest's power of absolution. The power to judge takes two forms. It may be a public power to pronounce to God's People the absolution of their sins as a result of their public confession of them. It may also be a private power to sit in judgment for Christ, and to pronounce His absolution for the individual penitent. In the private exercise of this power the element of judgment is most clearly visible. For whereas the priest cannot really effectively exercise Christ's power of judgment in connection with absolution in the public forum, it is precisely the aspect of judg-

ment which makes itself manifest in private confession.<sup>7</sup>

In addition to these elements of participation in Christ's priestly power, the priesthood contains another element directed to the power to bless in Christ's Name. This may be seen in the analogous signs of Baptism and Confirmation. In the rite of Baptism, the newly baptized is formally admitted into the fellowship of the Church by the priest's blessing. More particularly, in Confirmation the Holy Spirit is given anew to the baptized person through the rite of laying-on-of-hands. While anglicans reserve the performance of the sign of Confirmation to the office of a bishop, many other Christians recognize the power of laying-on-of-hands for Confirmation to be capable of delegation to the priesthood. Regardless of which view we may prefer, there appears to be an inherent connection between the rites of Baptism and Confirmation. Baptism functions more as simple initiation, and Confirmation as the exercise of the power to bless in Christ's Name, and thereby to transmit the Holy Spirit.

Another aspect of the priest's participation in Christ's power to bless is found in the practice of the sign of Holy Matrimony. While the sign itself is, indeed, effected by the mutual actions of the couple to be married, the full solemnization of Matrimony includes Christ's and the Church's blessing of the couple through the action of the priest. Again, we see an instance in which the power to bless in Christ's Name forms an element of priesthood

in the Church.

In summary, the office of Priest will be seen to include the power to represent Christ in the eucharistic assembly, and there to offer Christ's eucharistic sacrifice, the power to judge for Christ in absolution, and the power to bless in Christ's Name, and thereby to direct the operation of the Holy Spirit.

The office of the Episcopate represents a further perfection of participation in Christ's Priesthood. It includes the power to choose and to commission for Christ in the setting aside of priests and deacons. Thus, the performance of the sign of Ordination is properly the performance of the episcopate, although priests might also lay on hands at an Ordination as an exercise of their power to bless. Here we should note again the close connection between jurisdiction and office. In the ordering of men for the ministry, the bishop exercises his jurisdiction as an official of the Church's government in choosing and commissioning those who are to act as ordained ministers in his jurisdiction. At the same time, the bishop in Christ's stead chooses and commissions for Christ those who are to serve in the ordained ministry. This power to choose for Christ is a further participation in Christ's priestly power, and is a result of the increased participation in Christ's Priesthood which has become the bishop's by his consecration.

Another power which is peculiarly delegated to the episcopate is the power to rule in Christ's place. It

should be noted that this power is not essentially one of jurisdiction, but one of office. It is a power which is inherent in the episcopate itself, and not the result of any arrangement for ecclesiastical government. This means that the Church's government is at its core hierarchical and undemocratic; it is not egalitarian. There are those in Christ's Body the Church who have the office of ruling. This power to rule most frequently manifests itself in the primacy of the bishop in representing Christ at the Eucharist, and in the responsibility for assuming the teaching role in the Church, often referred to as the teaching magisterium. The episcopate thus represents the addition of two new powers to those which the priest shared with Christ by virtue of his priestly ordination, namely the power to choose and to commission for Christ in setting aside ordained ministers,<sup>8</sup> and the power to rule in Christ's place.

A serious question at the heart of much ecumenical discussion arises at this juncture. Is there the possibility of any further perfection in the making manifest of Christ's Priesthood for His People? Specifically, it can be argued that the office of the Pope is such a further perfection, and that it sums up all the other powers delegated from Christ's Priesthood. The issue for ecumenical discussion is whether the Papacy is a presidency among equals, or whether it represents an additional sharing in the Priesthood of Christ.<sup>9</sup> At this point in time, the thrust for unity among separated Christians tends toward the acceptance of

the Papacy as the center of unity in the Church, perhaps precisely because the Papacy is located in a single person, who might thereby best serve as the "visibility" of Christian unity. It should be noted that the office and jurisdiction of the Papacy could be more clearly separated. While the Roman Pontiff currently claims ordinary jurisdiction throughout the entire Church by virtue of his office, that jurisdiction could be altered by canon law. The primacy of the papal office, however, and its intensified sharing in the manifestation of Christ's Priesthood, might prove acceptable to many separated Christians.

Finally, the diaconate must be investigated to determine the degree to which it participates in Christ's Priesthood. Clearly, all the powers of participation which have been described for the priest and the bishop have not been given to the diaconate. Indeed, in terms of these powers of Christ's Priesthood, the deacon stands in no different position than the unordained Christian. On the other hand, it may capture substantially more of the original concept of the office of deacon if we locate in the deacon a specific power (shared by the priest and the bishop) which still represents an intensification of Christ's Priesthood. This diaconal power is the power to serve others in Christ's place. While every Christian has the obligation to love his neighbor as himself, and thus to exhibit brotherly and neighborly love, it can be argued that the deacon has the specific power and obligation to serve others with Christ's love, in

Christ's place. In this fashion a discrete participation in Christ's priestly power is delegated to the deacon at his ordination. While the power delegated does not infringe on the increased participation in Christ's Priesthood of the priest and bishop, it does underscore the essential servant nature of the diaconate.

In the preceeding pages we have attempted to set forth the concept that priesthood in the Church is a participation in the Priesthood of Christ. We have suggested that the sign of Holy Orders is the means whereby this participation is realized in the ordained ministry. We must now examine the Church's participation in Christ's Priesthood from its own perspective. That is, we must examine the manner in which priesthood may be said to be a continuum.

To begin with, priesthood has been seen to be inherent in Christian Baptism. By the very fact of his baptism, the Christian participates in that Priesthood which is an element of the reality of Christ. The baptismal participation in Christ's Priesthood is, however, the least fully developed form of participation which is possible for the Christian. In any system or scale of degrees of participation, simple baptismal priesthood is the form which is most lacking in fullness. It is the form which is largely potentiality, and which is least actualized. Despite this, baptism nonetheless includes the wholeness of Christ's Priesthood. By cooption into Christ's Body the Church, the People of God, the Christian already shares the fullness of Christ's Priesthood,

in potentia. This is a central concept. The model for it is the very model of salvation itself. The Christian is one who is on a pilgrimage, one who is not now what he shall become. The Christian life is a life of process; it is a life of sanctification. Thus, while we say that the Christian is not yet what he shall become, at the same time we say that he is already that which he shall become. He already contains the potentiality of his own actuality. So it is with the Christian's participation in Christ's Priesthood. By Baptism the Christian is already caught up into Christ, wholly. Yet this wholeness is still to be perfected. By Baptism the Christian is already one with Christ's Priesthood yet this oneness is still to be perfected. It is still to be intensified and translated from potentiality to actuality.

Thus, in baptism the Christian participates in the wholeness of Christ's Priesthood, albeit partly by anticipation. This participation is intensified and further actualized by the Christian's reception of the sign of Holy Orders. By this sign participation in Christ's Priesthood is made more full. The highest end of this continuum of perfection is the reception of episcopal Orders. In them the greatest amount of potentiality is made over into actuality.

A problem which arises in considering participation in Christ's Priesthood regards the apparent separation of orders or ranks of the ordained ministry. The question might be: Is the sign of Holy Orders one sign, or is it three? The solution to this apparent problem is not overly crucial,



since priesthood in the Church may be seen as existing on a continuum. If we assert that the highest form of priesthood is the high-priesthood of the bishop (or perhaps of the Pope), then it is clear that the priesthood itself ranks next, and that diaconal orders rank below priesthood. Each of these ranks represents a further participation in the actualized Priesthood of Christ. What, then, are we to say about Baptism/Confirmation? Is it not also a form of Holy Orders?

Indeed, Baptism could be considered a part of the sign of Holy Orders. The distinction which limits "Holy Orders" to the reception of diaconate, priesthood and episcopate is, however, appropriate. The sign of Baptism effects significantly more than just a participation in Christ's Priesthood. It is the means whereby the unbaptized is made a Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom. It is the means of acquiring membership in Christ's Body the Church. The sign of Holy Orders effects none of these things. It only effects an intensification of participation in Christ's Priesthood. On these grounds it seems appropriate to continue to distinguish between Baptism and Holy Orders, much as between the general and the specific. In much the same way we can understand that the sign of Holy Orders is applied to three separate advancements, or intensifications, in Christ's Priesthood. The sign itself, the sacramental rite is performed in each case, but with different intentions. The intention thus governs the degree of actualization of

Christ's Priesthood which occurs. Thus we can affirm that there are three separate rites, but only one sign.

This consideration leads directly to the next stage of our investigation. We have seen that Priesthood is a continuum in the Church. We now see that Christ's Priesthood is actualized in the recipient to the degree which is sought in the particular instance. Three rites produce three different participations. Yet as with Baptism itself, the fullness of Christ's Priesthood is potentially offered in each of the three rites. Since priesthood is a continuum in the Church, each intensification of its actuality in a given individual is essentially a re-offering of the fullness of priesthood. It is on this basis that the possibility of "perfecting" a degree of priesthood after it has been received is founded. That is, the degree of actualization of Christ's Priesthood may be specified in the performance of the sign in a number of different ways, and with a number of different understandings. Nonetheless, the intensification of participation in the individual can only occur in a limited number of ways: diaconate, priesthood and episcopate.<sup>10</sup> But a person may receive the sign of Holy Orders understanding that something less than a new participation in the Priesthood of Christ is being conveyed. Still, the very fact that the sign has been performed will mean that the person involved has to some extent received the actuality of the sign's effect. What the individual has not received in actuality, he has received in potentiality, and therefore the fullness

of the degree of priesthood received may be "after-acquired" in actuality. The grace of the sign is given in the rite, but it remains for the recipient to claim it as his own.

But how do we know the extent of Christ's Priesthood which is appropriated in any given instance? Since priesthood is a continuum, it is necessary that there be some idea as to the extent of priesthood which is appropriated in any given case. To this end, the "visibility" of the rite itself is of crucial importance. The rite is visible in two different manners. First, it is visible in the external forum. That is, the rite is observable to the hypothetical observer as something which he can understand. Something intelligible is happening. Second, the rite is visible in the internal forum. That is, the participants in the rite understand that something is happening.

In understanding the degree to which Christ's Priesthood is being appropriated, both the external and the internal forums are involved. The sign of Holy Orders is made visible to others by the external rite. It is made visible to the Church itself, and specifically to the officiant and the ordinand, by means of the internal intent of the rite. In the external forum the sign is visible to all; in the internal forum the sign is visible to the Church. Thus the external rite by which the sign is performed is important because it signifies and makes visible to others the degree of Christ's Priesthood which is being appropriated to the particular individual. The internal intent connected

with the performance of the rite is important because it signifies to the Church the extent of Christ's Priesthood which it is intended to appropriate. A minimum of two parties have an internal intent in connection with the sign. First, the ordaining or consecrating Bishop(s) intends to transmit some degree of Christ's Priesthood. Second, the ordinand expects to receive some intensification of participation in Christ's Priesthood.

Since, however, Christ's Priesthood in the Church is a continuum, it is possible for there to be degrees of appropriation of it. We have seen that the external rite makes visible to others what degree is being appropriated, and that the internal intent of the participants makes visible to them and to the Church what degree is claimed. By the very fact that Christ's Priesthood for the Church is a continuum, then, it is possible that some concept of "defectiveness" in its appropriation may arise in connection with the transmission of Holy Orders. Defectiveness will be a function of the discrepancy between the degree of Christ's Priesthood which it appears (external), or which it is intended (internal), to appropriate in comparison with the degrees by which Christ's Priesthood may in fact be appropriated, viz: deacon, priest and bishop. This problem of defect will be discussed in greater detail below, but the point to be noticed here is that "defect" need not refer to "validity" (which is minimalist), but may refer to a function of "fullness" (which is maximalist). The concept of "defective orders" and "defective

sacraments" can be analyzed in terms of the discrepancy between the degree of Christ's Priesthood which in fact was transmitted to the recipient, at least in potentia, and that degree which was made "visible" in the external or internal forums.

We turn our attention now to a few of the classical problems in the doctrine of Holy Orders in the attempt to show that the application of the principles we have discussed above can be of assistance in understanding these problems in the contemporary Church.

The first, and perhaps principal problem is that of intention. When "intention" is used in connection with the sign of Holy Orders one of its meanings is to signify that which specifies the powers which are being appropriated to the ordinand. This is one "kind" of intention. It is that disposition of the will which isolates the powers, or the degree, of Christ's Priesthood which it is intended to transmit in the particular instance. Thus in the anglican Ordinal: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work  
<sup>11</sup>  
 of a Priest in the Church of God...".

But intention is also involved, in a slightly different sense, in any celebration of a sacramental sign. This is the intention to do what Christ does, that is, to make visible and real that which Christ is doing. In connection with the sign of Holy Orders this aspect of intention is the assertion that the Church intends in the performance of this sign to appropriate that degree of Christ's Priesthood

which, in fact, Christ wills be appropriated.

In the classical understanding of the doctrine of Holy Orders there has been much discussion of the problem of a defect of intention in connection with ordinations and consecrations. This defect has been understood to occur in many ways. One is the so-called defect of external intention. This defect relates to the possibility of recognition of the sign by others. It is much the same thing as the "visibility of the sign in the external forum" which is discussed above. The question which raises this issue asks, "What is this rite I am attending?" A defect of external intention occurs when it is not possible to determine with normal observation what it is that is going on. The intention of the People of God is not visible to the observer. (The observer is considered not to be privy to the private intentions of the participants.) A typical case would be the non-Christian guest invited to an ordination. He must be able to tell from the external rite what it is that the Church is intending to do. The required information may be gathered from the title of the service in the service book, by the words which are used, and by the actions which are entered into during the rite. The important point is that external intention relates to the visibility of the Church,<sup>12</sup> Christ's Body, to others.

External intention is necessary. The Church must appear to be appropriating a degree of Christ's Priesthood. There exists, however, the possibility that occasions might

require that the rite be celebrated in secrecy, as for example during times of persecution. In such cases the external intention is still present, although it may be that there is no one to "observe" it other than those who have an internal private intention as well. This does not "invalidate" the sign, but it lessens the possibility that the external intention, expressed in secret, can be used as an argument for the "validity" of the sign. The external intention is still present, but the external observer has become hypothetical. Such situations are, indeed, rare, but clearly not impossible.

Along with the possible defect of external intention, there is also the possibility of defect in the internal intention. While it has been cast in a number of ways, the defect of internal intention is essentially a defect in the visibility of the Church to itself. It is the situation which would occur where the Church did not intend to be itself. An intention not to be the Church is, of course, destructive of the possibility that one is being the Church on the occasion in question.

The defect of internal intention has been greatly overstressed, however. In examining it closely we see that it necessarily includes some conscious intention, because one is unable to perform the Church's signs without some bare intention to do so. However, the extent of this intention is very limited. The intention necessary is no more than the intention to do what the Body of Christ does.

It need be no more than the intention to do what Christ does and is doing in the rite involved. It is the intention to identify one's will with Christ's will.

The performer of the sign is required to have a conscious intention, although it may be habitual,<sup>13</sup> to do what Christ is doing. Whatever content this intention has is formed by the known tradition of the Church, and by interpretation of the Scriptures. The understanding of what Christ does, and therefore of what the Church which is His Body does, is built up through the Church's tradition. It is also the result of the individual's interpretation of the Scriptures in the light of the Church's teaching. But the intention to do what Christ is doing is often hardly conscious. Thus, the celebrant at Baptism, or at the Eucharist, usually takes for granted that he is doing what the Church does, and therefore what Christ is doing. Otherwise he would not be in that place, performing that act. Nor need he really believe in its effectiveness. It is enough if he believes that he is doing what the Body of Christ does.

A major problem is raised here when the performer of the sign has a misunderstanding of what the Church does, and of what Christ is in fact doing in the sign involved. Thus, for example, need the performer of Baptism intend to effect the regeneration of the baptized? It has long been<sup>14</sup> held by the Roman Church that he does not. It is enough that he intends to effect what Christ intends by Baptism, even if he is in error as to what it is that Christ wills.



To hold otherwise would ultimately be to embrace Donatism.

Nor, and this is crucial, can a later, fuller understanding of what it is that the Church does in a sign, and what it is that Christ is doing in it, be read back in time so as to question an earlier performance of the sign where the understanding was reportedly less full. Thus, if the understanding of what it is that a sign is changes, this does not thereby "invalidate" all of the performances of the sign which occurred before the refined understanding of the sign was accepted. Nor does an honest misunderstanding of the effect of a sign invalidate the performance of the sign. If the performer of the sign mistakenly believes that tradition and the Scriptures really teach one thing about the sign, while the Church may appear to have taught something else, it is not fatal. The issue becomes whether the performer acted in good conscience.

This raises the problem of what happens when the celebrant of a sacred sign performs his office with a basic misunderstanding of the meaning or effect of the sign involved, but performs it in good conscience. This problem becomes particularly acute where the understanding of the sign has changed over a period of time, such that the current judgment of the sign as performed at that past time would have to be that the celebrant ought to have known that he had a misunderstanding of it. In essence, this is an hermeneutical problem. It involves the case where the interpreter in the present fails to understand that the error

in the past was, in fact, an honest error. This type of misunderstanding is especially easy to fall into when the basic, unrefined theories which ultimately produce the later, more refined opinion are current to the prior case. It is submitted that the anglican position on the doctrine of sacrifice in the Eucharist is a demonstration of this point. The anglican position in the sixteenth century was that the then Roman doctrine of the Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist was repugnant to the Scriptures, to metaphysics, and to a proper understanding of the Church. This is not to say that the then anglican position is opposed to the current position of the Roman Church. But rather, that the position of the Roman Church at that time was, rightly or wrongly, understood by anglicans to be one which had not been held by the historic Church in any traditional sense, and which was not supported by Scripture. In addition, this anglican position was held in good conscience. There is no evidence to suggest that these anglicans knew of a "better" teaching than the one they expounded. It does little good to argue that the anglicans should have understood the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice as it was to be finally refined in the nineteenth century.<sup>15</sup> They were, of course sixteenth century men. Nor does it help to assert that these anglicans were not intending to do what Christ and the Church does. They were intending to do just that! Otherwise they would not have taken the trouble to "reform" what they thought needed to be reformed in the eucharistic liturgy. This is

not to argue that they were right in any objective sense. It is simply to say that what they did, they did in good conscience. At the very worst, their posture was that of being in error in good conscience.

In order to understand the effect of error of this sort, it is necessary to employ the kinds of tools which biblical scholars have learned to use in hermeneutical questions. The issue for modern man becomes whether he can disassociate himself from the understanding of the past which has been made his by his education in the present. Can he really put himself back in the position of a man in the sixteenth century? Surely, this is a most difficult thing to do, and it is the principal reason that so little progress has been made in solving these hard issues. The critical reasoning of the later centuries dealing with eucharistic sacrifice, as is especially set forth in the Bull Apostolicae Curiae, seems at first sight to be "fool-proof" when applied to the situation of the sixteenth century. It is suggested here, however, that the crucial issue is that the Bull unconsciously assumes the progress of theological studies during the interim period, and thus is able to charge the sixteenth century anglicans with obvious error, when in fact the anglicans thought that they had no choice in the matter if they were to adhere to the ancient faith of the Church. They acted in good conscience, without any understanding that they were wrong, especially not "wrong" in a nineteenth century sense. Had they known they were "wrong", but still

wished to act "wrongly", everyone would agree that such facts would suggest the invalidity of their position; they would be saying that they knew what the Body of Christ did in a given situation, and that they consciously chose not to do it. Such would be an open repudiation of being the Church, which is exactly what the anglican reformers claimed they were trying to be.

This discussion is relevant to the question concerning what happens when the celebrant of a sacred sign performs his office with a basic misunderstanding of the meaning or effect of his act. At stake is the necessity for preserving a certain historical or hermeneutical perspective. The understanding of the celebrant must be evaluated in terms of what the real options were for his thinking in the period in which the questioned event occurred, and in addition the issue as to whether he acted in good conscience must be raised. It is submitted that if the celebrant intended to do what the Church does, and thus what Christ does, and if he believed that that was what he was doing, the sign is effectively performed, regardless of the actual objective "error" in the celebrant's understanding. Thus, in the case of the anglican reformers' ordinations, if there was an intention to be the Church, and to do what it was believed Christ and the Church did, then the sign of Holy Orders was performed in the anglican community, despite the fact that the anglicans may have had a less than full understanding of the nature of Eucharistic sacrifice.

The argument has been raised, principally by F. Clark,

that this situation is impossible as described, since the celebrant of the rite in question had "conflicting double intentions."<sup>16</sup> That is, that he intended both to do what the Church does, and also specifically to do something which he knew is not what the Church does. In such an instance Clark is correct that there is no effective intention to do what the Church does. The problem for Clark is essentially an hermeneutical one, however, since it cannot be shown that the celebrant involved did not think that what he was doing was, indeed, what the Church does. The specific information needed to prove conflicting intentions can only be inferred from later evidence, such as the subsequent sophistication of Roman eucharistic theology, and the admitted changes in later anglican formulae. The fact is, however, that these changes are later in time, and cannot be used to call into question an earlier set of facts. To do so is essentially to say that these separated anglican Christians intended a fraud. They knew that they were not doing what the Church and Christ does, but they claimed that they were in order to perpetuate this monstrous hoax. History simply does not supply evidence that such was the case. It must, therefore, be maintained that these anglican Christians acted in good conscience, and thought they were doing what Christ does. Under these circumstances it is asserted that Christ's grace is active in the sacred sign, and is transmitted through it in an effective manner.

A different problem is raised in connection with the

possible defect of matter in the celebration of the sign of Holy Orders. In the first instance, it must be admitted that the concept of the "matter" of the sign of Holy Orders has changed. Currently it is said to be the laying-on-of-hands,<sup>17</sup> At other times it has included the handing over of the instruments, vesting of the ordinand, and the like.

A provisional definition of "matter" might be that it is the traditional making physically visible the appropriation of Christ's Priesthood in both the external and internal forums. Thus, both to the outsider and to the Church, the matter makes physically visible that which the Church claims to be doing. Thus it manifests the appropriation of Christ's Priesthood. Therefore, where there is a failure of matter, and the failure is only formal while the visibility of the act remains (such as where hands are not actually laid upon the ordinand's head, but held a few inches above it), it can be argued that the defect itself is only formal, and that as a result the sign is effective. The orders are "valid", although the rite is irregular.

But, on the other hand, where the failure of matter is so substantial that the visibility of the act is destroyed (as where there is no laying-on-of-hands at all) the defect is material, and the sign is not effectively performed. It should be noted that there is a very close connection here to a defect in intention. The failure to make visible the matter of a sign suggests that there is no intention to perform the sign. Thus, the internal forum must be checked

to determine what the intention of the Church to itself was. Did it intend to do what the Church does? This is covered by the requirement in the proposed definition, above, that the "matter" of the sign of Holy Orders includes the making visible of the appropriation of Christ's Priesthood in both forums.

Yet another classical problem in connection with the sign of Holy Orders is the oft-referred to defect of form. It deals with the question whether the rite signifies an intention to appropriate Christ's Priesthood, and therefore it is really again a question dealing with the Church's intentions. The issue has to become: Did the Church in this given instance intend to do what the Church does in setting aside a man for the ministry? It is, of course, possible for the Church to have been in error in its understanding of what it does, but if the error was honest, that is not malicious, it must be held that the intention is not per se defective. The form used for the performance of the sign must then signify that the Church is setting someone aside for the ministry, and that it is doing what it understands the Church does to bring this about. The Preface to the anglican Ordinal is a good example of the determination of a form to precisely this end.

If it is later held that the form of a given Christian community is defective, some additional questions have to be asked before it can be determined that the sign claimed to have been effected in the past was not, in fact, effected due

to this defect of form. First, it must be asked whether the Church thought the form was defective at the time. This is essentially the question as to honest intention. Second, was the visibility of the rite destroyed? Thus, if the Church appeared to be holding an ordination, and claimed to be holding an ordination, and honestly believed that the form was effective to produce an ordination, it must be held that the defect of form was not fatal. It may be, however, that the defect was of such a scope that the degree of Christ's Priesthood which was appropriated in actuality was less than would have been the case with an undefective form. The remaining portion of the appropriation may only have been received in potentia. In this instance, however, the grace received in potentia can be converted to actuality by the later recognition by the ordinand that there was a less than full understanding of the possible appropriation of Christ's Priesthood. This recognition must be coupled with a will to intensify the appropriation at the later time. This does not prevent the just requirement by ecclesiastical authority that there be some act of jurisdictional recognition on the part of the ordinand prior to his assumption of the performance of the duties connected with his now increased participation in Christ's Priesthood.

Finally, the defect of form is essentially fatal if it is dishonest, perverse and malicious, as where the form in ordination might be "Take thou authority to be a witch doctor etc...". Then the visibility of the sign is wholly



destroyed, and no appropriation of Christ's Priesthood takes place at all, because none was in fact intended. It is asserted that such situations are rare, if even existent.

## Chapter Four:

### The Status of Separated Holy Orders

In this Chapter the perspective which we have been taking on the phenomenon of Holy Orders among the People of God will be slightly altered. We shall now try to take cognizance of the fact that Christians are not one body in the political sense, but rather are often apparently at odds, and hardly on speaking terms. While we have recognized in Chapter II that in a most profound sense the People of God already are one on the phenomenological level of their common baptism into the One Body of Christ, we cannot escape the reality that the Church, as an institution, appears not to be one. What effect, then, does this fact have on an understanding of Holy Orders?

It can be argued that the Church is institutionally one. Indeed, this was once the widely held position of the Roman Church, and of certain separatist Protestants. Today, however, the "one true Church" position is not held by a significant number of twentieth century theologians, save perhaps among some Orthodox brethren in the East. It is surely the witness of Vatican Council II that the "true Church" position has fallen into disgrace, officially at least.

Given, then, that the People of God, the Church, is in some sense divided, what effect does this have on Priesthood in the Church? To begin with, we must question

whether, if Priesthood in the Church is an appropriation of and participation in the Priesthood of Christ Himself, it is possible to discuss Christ as though He were divided. We have argued that the manifestation of Christ's Priesthood through priesthood in the Church is an essential part of Christ's nature. Yet even the most conservative members of the western tradition will admit that a "valid" priesthood exists in parts of the Body of Christ from which they are separated, as for example is the case in the Roman recognition of Eastern Orders, or in the anglican recognition of Roman Orders. Thus, added to the fact that we cannot escape the presence of Christians in the world who are institutionally separated from us, we now also have to admit that there are instances of "valid" ministries among these separated Christians.

These facts become crucial when we recognize that one aspect of Christ's Priesthood is its unity. Christ is one and His Priesthood is one. More than that, however, the manifestation of His Priesthood among His People is itself unitive. Through His Priesthood, Christ gathers up His People into the unity of the Divine Life. If, therefore, Christ's Priesthood alleged to be manifested in His Church does not effect the unity of the Christians who might be assembled at a given place, it must be that the participation in Christ's Priesthood which is in fact manifested in that place is somehow defective. This is to say that dis-unity among Christians is itself an indication of a lack of

perfection or intensification in their sharing in His Priesthood. Initial sharing in Christ's Priesthood comes with baptism, and it is unitive sharing. The People of God is defined as all baptized persons. The introduction of the sign of Holy Orders, as things now stand, causes this initial unity to be destroyed, even though the introduction of Holy Orders is a further manifestation of Christ's Priesthood. This phenomenon could only occur if the several introductions of Christ's Priesthood, caused by the performance of the sign of Holy Orders among separated Christians, in fact always resulted in a less than completely full appropriation of that Priesthood. To argue otherwise is either to say that Christ's Priesthood is essentially not one, but is fragmented among Christians such that different groups participate in Christ differently, which would be to argue that Christ's Priesthood is not a unity, or, alternatively to assert that there is but one group which has a full sharing in Christ's Priesthood, the rest being to some degree defective. We have noted that the latter position cannot be held due, for example, to the Roman recognition of Eastern Orders.

We are thus forced to maintain that the fact of institutional dis-unity among Christians is necessarily reflected in the partial defectiveness of separated Holy Orders, no matter whose Orders are being discussed. These separated, and therefore defective, Orders can occur in two situations. The division in the Body of Christ may

be between groups of Christians. This is the usual case of the separations we meet in the ecumenical movement. These divisions mean that since these Christians are not in communion with one another, they are in some sense not fully in communion with Christ either, since that communion is one which is defined by its unity. This lack of fullness does not mean that the separated bodies do not share sufficiently in Christ's Priesthood, but rather that they could share more fully than they do. In addition to these cases, it is possible for there to be dis-unity between an individual Christian and the Church. This means that a lack of perfection in the appropriation of Christ's Priesthood occurs in the personal instance of every minister of Christ who purports to have received the grace of Holy Orders. There are, for him, other ministers of Christ who make the same claim as he, and with whom he is not in the fullness of communion such as would characterize the unity of the Priesthood of Christ.

The unity of Christ's Priesthood is manifested in the regional Church in the office and person of the Bishop. He is the symbol of the singleness of Christ's Priesthood, and the individual priests under him are saved from separation from each other by their common union in him. Thus, the Bishop is a type of the unity of Christ's Priesthood for the whole People of God. It is for this reason that there can properly be but one bishop in a given region who holds the fullness of the episcopal office. Where he requires

assistance in the performance of his functions an inferior bishop must be created. Indeed, the fact that in a regional unit there will be "bishops" of several Christian allegiances but goes to enforce the feeling that the divisions of Christians somehow result in partly defective Orders. The scandal is evident in a plurality of "bishops" each claiming the same See. The unity of Christ's Priesthood for His People is obviously broken where competing "bishops" exist.

The unity of the episcopate is the trans-regional symbol of the unity of Christ's Priesthood. This unity is manifested in the concepts of collegiality which have been so well expressed by Vatican Council II.<sup>1</sup> The principle, reduced to its simplest terms, demands that the bishops of the People of God must be in unity with each other, and together thus form an episcopal college which is successor to the College of the Apostles. As successor it shows forth the unity of Christians in the time dimension. As college it shows forth the unity of Christians in the space dimension. This collegial unity is world-wide in scope, and is not, nor could it be, limited to any particular region or country. It represents an essential unitive imperative, on account of which the Church must always reject any concept of regional or national identity which would operate to cut a portion of God's People off from their fellows in Christ.

It is in connection with the collegiality of the bishops of the People of God that the office of the Papacy

can be seen to acquire an important reason for its existence. The Papacy is the potential symbol for the unity of the Episcopal College.<sup>2</sup> It is that See with which each of the collegial bishops are formally in union. As the priests of a diocese are in union with each other because they are in union with their bishop, so also the widely separated bishops of the world can be actually in union with each other through their union with the Pope. The Papal Office shows forth the unity of Christ's Priesthood for the Church by being its focal point. It also shows forth the unity of God's People by representing the unity of the priesthood given for them. In the renewal of the Church it will become imperative that the bishops and faithful, separated from the See of Rome, come to understand that they must find some way to recognize that See as the God-given symbol of unity in the Church. Their new-found unity will then be a unity which is rooted in the aspect of unity found in the Priesthood of Christ.

We have suggested that the very fact of divisions among the institutions of the Church manifests the fact that the ministries of these separated institutions are to some degree less full than they might be. They are to some degree imperfect. This is a principal issue for ecumenism today. What can be done to increase this fullness, and to cure these defects, so that the unity of God's People may be shown forth? Again we return to the distinction of internal and external forums which was developed in

Chapter III. The internal forum is that in which the visibility of the Church as the Body of Christ is manifest to itself. The external forum is that in which it is manifest to others. In the internal forum, what should be done about separated Orders? As an absolute minimum it is necessary that the separated ministries acknowledge that their ministries are participations in the Priesthood of Christ, that to that extent, at least, there is a degree of "supernatural" endowment connected with them, and that participation in the Priesthood of Christ is the only validating principle for their ministries. The next step is to admit the appropriation of Christ's Priesthood which has been made in a given ministry is less full than it might have been. Each separated ministry must admit to being in need of possible intensification. This is true even for the most "valid" of ministries, because they are being lived out in separation from the unity of the priesthood which is an essential element of Christ's Priesthood for His People. This is not to say that any human capitulations are in order. They are not because, in the end, there is no one but Christ to capitulate to. But it is to say that each of the separated ministries must give up its separatist claims, and see that so long as it remains in separation it is less than full in its appropriation of Christ's Priesthood for His People.

In the external forum, the principal demand is that appropriate symbols of the unity of Christ's Priesthood be



made manifest in the world. Unity in Christ, and the unity of Christ, must be made visible and manifest. Thus, separated ministries must be publicly reconciled, as well as reconciled within the private world of the institutions of the Church. At the first stages of ecumenism, where we are today, it may be that joint worship and joint action are the only easily displayed external symbols of unity. More must and will be found, however, as the People of God come to see the absolute need for showing forth the unity of Christ in the visible unity of His People. As long as separated Holy Orders exist in the Body of Christ, its participation in Christ's Priesthood will be, to some degree, less than full. It is submitted that the changes in the external and internal forums outlined above are of absolute necessity to the actualization of Christ's full Priesthood for His People.

But, the question will be asked: What is the function of "faith" in connection with the fullness of the Body of Christ? The question asks the role of orthodoxy in the company of Christians. Indeed, this type of question, rather than the phenomenological ones we have been discussing, is the type of question which has been asked, and answered, in the Church for centuries. The question asks how one knows that he is right. It is concerned to raise clear standards of belief which may be accepted and then used to define membership in the Church. Perhaps in a day when biblical literalism and propositional

metaphysics went unchallenged, such questions were helpful. They are no longer today. Still they are asked, and the basic motivations which prompt them deserve to be treated fairly and as real concerns. The issue as to the role of faith in being a member of the People of God is built in to each of the major divisions of the Church. The East claims that adherence to The Faith, to Holy Tradition, is definitive of the Church. The Roman West claims to be able to establish irreformable propositions which must be accepted as true in order to gain membership in the community. The Protestant West has made the "confession" of biblical truth the standard by which a covenanting Christian is identified. In each instance these separated Christians have claimed that some faith principle, or test of orthodoxy, is required to define the People of God. Above we have suggested that the phenomenological situation of being in union with Christ by baptism is the determinative element for being a member of the People of God. What then about faith?

Simply, the faith problem is taken up into the phenomenological requirement to be and to do what Christ and His Body the Church is and does. In Pauline terms, the problem is solved by focusing on the demand to be en christō. That is, that the People of God is a prime reality for the Christian, and his membership in it is phenomenological rather than covenantal, in the sense of propositional. One becomes a member by Baptism. A statement of adherence to the commonality of Christian tradition may be an intelligent

way to test whether the expressed desire for baptism is serious, but such a statement does not make one a Christian, baptism does. The Christian does not so much "believe in" God as he does "belong to" Him. Thus, the function of faith, or confession, is at best secondary to the existential situation of membership in the People of God. Yet it is the case that the elements which divide God's People today are essentially problems in faith definition on the most obvious level. It may be that serious social, economic and psychological differences actually account for much of the division among Christians, but these divisions are usually articulated as problems relating to faith, that is, problems of heresy.

It is suggested here, however, that the root problem which divides Christians today, given the historic divisions which contemporary Christians have not so much made as inherited, is the problem of certainty. The separated Christian asks, "How do I know where the fullness of the Body of Christ is?" He wants to be a part of that fullness. He wants to be and do what Christ and His Body the People of God are and do. The problem is how he is to know what that is. Traditionally he has sought inside himself, said his prayers and listened to the historic voice of the Church. All these things are a part of the Christian life, and they are not about to come to an end, or to be superceded in their own realms. However, the questions which the separated Christian is asking about his certainty as a Christian

ultimately have phenomenological, and not intellectual, answers. The Christian finds his certainty, in the end, by being caught up a living member into the People of God, by being made one with Christ. We have suggested that the episcopate is central to this process. The believer finds his certainty in his allegiance to his Bishop, who is for him the symbol of Christ's Priesthood to him. Indeed, it is his bishop's participation in the collegiality of the episcopate which provides the certain proof for the believer that he is a sure member of the People of God. It is on this account that the separations in the episcopal college are so grievous. The lack of fullness inherent in a given bishop's participation in the Priesthood of Christ, made evident by the divisions which he maintains with his episcopal brethren, go far to encourage the anxiety of the Christian, namely that he might not be a member of the People of God. For too long the doubting believer has been told to have faith, and that thereby he will know that he is on the right track.

The episcopal responsibility to govern for Christ, and to rule over His People, involves a recognition on the part of the episcopate that its participation in Christ's Priesthood also includes, in its fullness, a responsibility to make visible for all men to see the fact by Christ's Priesthood, thus made manifest, all men are called to share in the Divine Life, and to have a place in the Divine Future. The problem of "faith", or orthodoxy, is subsumed

and put in perspective when we consider that the issues of certainty are not solved on the level of "faith" in the first instance, but rather are secondary to membership in the People of God, which is the Body of Christ, the prime reality for Christians.

The role of the test of "faith" in the Body of Christ is destined to undergo change as the moves for Christian unity progress. If membership, and not belief, becomes recognized as the essential element of certainty about being of the People of God, what is to become of the intellectual side of membership? It is not suggested here that a phenomenological approach to understanding the People of God should supplant honest investigation into the content of the Christian message, nor, on the other hand, that the episcopate ought to take the position of the Grand Inquisitor. We can neither avoid our responsibility as rational beings to investigate our perceived world, nor can we tolerate ecclesiastical dictatorship. But, we can admit that there must be room in the company of God's People for a great deal of intellectual freedom. There must be room for honest error, and for honest doubt. There must be room for development, and for growing into fullness. The phenomenological approach to the People of God requires that there be always the possibility of development.

Principal among the freedoms of the Christian must be the rights of conscience. If a member of Christ's People feels that to be and do what Christ is and does he must

think a certain way on some subject, there must be respect for his conscience. Difficult problems will always arise in applying such a principle because it is often difficult for the many to understand how the few could be so "wrong" (or vice-versa). The usual solution is to suggest that the conscience of the opponent must be malicious, and therefore that it can be licitly disregarded. The error is said not to be honest. But with the decline of the metaphysical world-view of the last several centuries we must come to recognize that intellectual certainty is by no means so easy to come by, and that what appeared to be yesterday's heresy often has turned out to be, after much travail, today's orthodoxy. In the fullness of the existence of the People of God there must be found room for much divergence.

The problem for God's People in the near future will be to come up with some integrative, and yet testing principle which can be used to assess the positions held by Christians which are claimed to be in "good conscience". It would seem that a simple and direct principle would be that the person holding the opinion which is in question must be willing to state that he is quite ready to change his mind on the issue. If the possibility of his mind being changed is still present, he has not absolutized his position to the degree that it has become an idol.

The obverse of this argument is to assert that the Church, the Body of Christ, must also always stand ready to change its mind. While Christians may feel committed

to a concept of Revelation which has a once-for-all aspect to it, the human articulation of the "deposit of faith" is always open to re-interpretation. Even concerning its central core of "faith", the Church must be ready to change its mind, or perhaps more precisely to change its articulation of its mind so that the unchanging nature of its mind<sup>3</sup> may be made manifest.

The room for error and doubt, the respect for the rights of conscience, and the continuing possibility of being open to change will be the marks of the People of God as they participate more fully in the life which is theirs in Christ. On the issue of Holy Orders and their "validity" there will be tacit admission that separated Orders are, by the fact of their separation, less full than they might be, and consequently that some degree of Christ's Priesthood for His People has not been appropriated for their use. The impetus to show forth the unity of Christ and the unity of His Priesthood for His People will, and does, demand the recognition that separated ministries within the Church must be reconciled, both to apply the fruits of Christ's Priesthood to His People for their salvation, and also to put the traditional issues of "certainty" and "faith" into a perspective such that they can be useful rather than divisive for the unity of the People of God. The "status" of separated Holy Orders will be seen to be unsupportable, because by their separation they prevent the appropriation of the fullness of the good things Christ has for His People. In doing this

separated Orders perpetuate a separation of man from God,  
which is something traditional theology has always called  
sin.



## Chapter Five:

### The Status of Anglican Orders

In our investigations, our attention must now be directed to the specific question of the status of anglican Orders. At the outset there are several things which should be taken as admitted. Among these is the fact that whatever else may be said in behalf of the "validity" of anglican Orders, these Orders are separated from the Orders of the vast majority of other Christians. This is true both with regard to those whom anglicans would recognize as possessing "valid" Orders, and those whom they would not so recognize. Not only are anglican Orders separated from other Orders, they are, or have been, the subject of defense by anglicans, and of attack by others. They are a subject of controversy in themselves, and thus are a part of the divisive situation which they also symbolize.

We have suggested in Chapter IV that any separated Holy Orders are an indication that the fullness of the Priesthood of Christ has not been appropriated. Therefore it must be admitted that whether or not anglican Christians have such a participation in Christ's Priesthood that their Orders might be called "valid" (whatever that means), anglican Orders, by the very fact that they are "anglican", are a less full participation in Christ's Priesthood than they might be.

Further, it is apparent that the demand for greater fullness cannot be avoided, and that therefore in the end something must be done to take away the separatist nature of these separated Orders.

Before we can propose any concrete suggestions as to how the scandal of division might be reduced, it is necessary to apply some of the principles we have developed above to the current situation, and thus to determine what the current status of anglican Orders might be said to be.

Thus, we can first ask: Does there appear to be an external intention on the part of anglicans to appropriate Christ's Priesthood through the sign of Holy Orders? The answer to this question has to be in the affirmative. From the beginning, the anglican Ordinals have described the office to which the ordinand is being admitted as the "Priesthood". While it is quite correct that the description of the office is largely to be found in the Preface to the printed rite as it appears in the anglican service books, this fact is not of signal importance because the service book (The Book of Common Prayer) is a public book in anglicanism in a manner in which the Ordinal in other communions often is not. The anglican Ordinal is, for example, written in the vernacular and generally available to the people, rather than being restricted to those celebrants who might have cause to use it. This is a fact which is of importance in assessing the anglican external intention. The argument is often advanced that in the sixteenth century, at least, anglicans did not

intend to have "real" priests. If the internal intention, or what we have called the "intention in the internal forum" is meant by this statement, it raises important questions which will be dealt with below. If, however, what is meant is the intention of anglicans in the "external forum", then the anglican service books speak for themselves. They clearly provide a service of Ordination for the purpose of appropriating Christ's ministry to His People by granting a share of it to the specific ordinand involved. It is generally acknowledged that such is the case with the current anglican rite, but it is usually asserted that the defect of intention in the external forum is to be found in the Ordinal of 1552. This claim cannot be supported on a reading of the book involved. In terms of its visibility to the external world, it is clear that the anglicans were intending to do what they thought Christ intended in the granting of an historic ministry of "bishops, priests and deacons" to His Church. The preservation of that historic ministry, and the importance of it, are both asserted in the externals of the anglican services, one of which externals<sup>1</sup> is the public service books which were used at the time.

Of far more crucial concern is the question whether anglicans have and do intend to appropriate Christ's Priesthood through the sign of Holy Orders when viewed from the perspective of the internal forum. The issue is whether anglicans have historically made visible to themselves the fact that they were intending to appropriate the Priesthood

of Christ. In one sense, at least, it must be considered that they have not done so. By the very nature of the fact that the entirety of the Sarum Ordinal was not simply translated into english and used, it is suggested that the anglicans intended a change of some sort. And it must be thought that this change concerned itself in part with the nature of Christ's Priesthood as it could be appropriated by His People. The early anglican Ordinals made careful changes from the historic british usage which, indeed, eliminated such words as "Priest" and substituted "Presbyter" in its place. There was a definite attempt, especially in 1552, to eliminate the concept of the priest as a "mass sacrificing" priest. The nominalism of the day also caused problems in understanding the fashion in which Christ might be considered to be present under the species of bread and wine in the Eucharist. These and other problems, which were generally faced in the sixteenth century, resulted in statements and solutions utilized in anglican practice which were a rejection of at least parts of the usage which the Church had theretofore employed in Britain.

Indeed, it is frankly fair to say that there were "errors" or serious disruption with the historic tradition expressed in the anglican experiences of the period in question. Central among these for the purpose of investigating the status of anglican Orders is the anglican concept of the priesthood. This is the point which has been the center  
2  
of the later debate about anglican Orders. The argument

runs that if the anglicans held a defective view of the Priesthood, then that must be what they intended in the internal forum, and consequently their Ordinations were invalid because they did not intend to ordain to the "real priesthood etc.,". Although in an ideal world such an argument might be able to escape the criticism of being circular, it is not in accord with the facts which surrounded the period in which these problems are said to have occurred. We are once again reduced to investigating what the effect is of "error" in understanding the nature of Christ's Priesthood, and the fullness of it which may be appropriated in Ordination. Indeed, the problem resides in the statement that there was error in understanding. The period in question was one in which the views of Christ's Priesthood for His People were by no means as obviously clear as now appears. Indeed, it must be admitted that even in our day, the nature of Christ's Priesthood for His People and the nature of His Presence in the Eucharist are both undergoing vast expansion in the thinking of theologians. It simply cannot be said that in any earlier period it was perfectly clear to the thinking Christian what the answers to questions about the Priesthood and about Sacrifice were. It is possible, of course, to take the position that the answers had been defined by the tradition of the Church up to that time, although even in such a position there is the problem of a diversity of opinions actually existing in the tradition. But the argument on the basis of tradition is basically an argument centered about who ought to be the interpreter of tradition, which is to say that it is an argument about jurisdiction and

authority. It is only possible to talk about errors in the conceptualization of sixteenth century theologians if one has a standard of truth with which to compare the doubtful positions. This standard simply did not exist outside of the teaching office of the Church, an office which at that time may have thought that propositional statements could be made which were not subject to essential revision, but which today has been quite willing to admit that many propositions once considered inviolate must now be recast in order to manifest the core of the Church's teaching in some new way which avoids the old metaphysics which were once thought "divine".

Thus, the issue for an understanding of sixteenth century views of Holy Orders (which differed from the teaching of Rome at that time) must be what is the effect of these errors, so-called. Especially, what is the effect of these errors when the persons making them honestly believe that they are correct, and that the "error" lies on the side of the teaching authority of Rome. The choice will be between saying that these errors are essential, and that therefore there is no freedom for doubt which results in changing the Church's practice, or on the other hand, saying that while these errors may well represent a significant deviation from the traditional position of the Church, they are errors in good conscience and therefore must not have destroyed the Priesthood of Christ among His People, although they may have resulted in a less than full appropriation of that

Priesthood in actuality. It is toward the latter option that any phenomenological, existential or functional approach toward the sign of Holy Orders must move.

Where the conceptualization of Christ's Priesthood, and the nature and manner of its appropriation by His People, is significantly lacking in fullness as the result of intellectual positions which are held by Christians in good conscience, it is important to investigate what the effect is of a later restoration to a more full understanding. This is particularly important in the case of anglican Orders due to the appearance of the Prayer Book of 1662. In that book, and all others which have followed it, the community of anglicans has restored some fullness of language to what is admittedly the impoverished text of the 1552 book. In particular, mention that the Priesthood is intended in the rite occurs with the laying-on-of-hands. There can be no doubt that in the external forum the anglican community is intending to appropriate the grace of the Priesthood through the celebration of the sign of Holy Orders.

So too, in the case of the anglican posture on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. There can be no real doubt today, for example, that a doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ is normative and "official" teaching for anglicans. Again, with the Eucharist the problem had arisen through the intellectual difficulties of late-medieval metaphysics, and it is like that during the early period of anglican separation from the rest of the Church there were held a

number of deviant positions on this subject. But, and this is the real issue, they were held in good conscience. There is no hint of a malicious position which would suggest that anglicans really knew better, but for some other reason than serving the truth they preferred to put forth positions which they themselves did not believe to be true. And, as in the case of the understanding of Holy Orders, anglicans have changed during the years and currently hold a more full understanding of the Eucharist than they did in the earlier period. Nor is this surprizing. The same phenomenon can be seen at work in the development of a fullness in Roman understandings of Eucharist and Priesthood.

Thus, and this is a matter which anglicans and other Christians concerned for unity must admit, there are aspects to the history of our separated existences which manifest a less than full understanding and appropriation of Priesthood for the Church. But, the failure was "innocent", and the shallower understandings are being deepened even today. What was but potentiality is becoming actual.

The crucial issue for our study at this point is to what extent did anglicans appropriate the Priesthood of Christ in the ordained ministry of their separated communion? This consideration is only possible on the theory that the Priesthood of Christ for His Church is manifested on a continuum. Where along that continuum do anglicans stand?

In any age, including ours, there will be degrees of understanding and appropriation of Priesthood. In this sense



there is no doubt but that there were periods of lesser fullness in the anglican appropriation of Priesthood. There is a clear indication in the Prayer Book of 1552 that the concept of Priesthood there set forth is significantly less complete than that espoused by, say, the reformers of the Oxford Movement. But the intention to preserve the Priesthood in the Church was also present, even at the times of supposed less fullness. The problem of expression in the book of 1552 results not from a desire to do away with Priesthood, but from a desire to express it more clearly. While we might now agree that the pressures of the sixteenth century actually clouded rather than cleared the expression of Priesthood among anglicans, the attempt to clarify was made in good conscience, and consequently the celebration of the sign of Holy Orders must be seen to have had the effect of appropriating Christ's Priesthood. But, since the view of priesthood was less full than we today think it ought to have been, we can also affirm that the Priesthood thus appropriated had a degree of fullness which contained a great deal of potential development.

That development has, in fact, taken place. The book of 1662 marks at least the beginning of a fullness. And, if there was no "lapse" of Orders in the phenomenological sense, then the restoration to fullness can be said to have taken place by 1662. This makes no mention of the fact that since 1662 profound development has taken place in articulated anglican theology, such that today there is generally a

high doctrine of the Priesthood among anglicans.

There is, however, a problem with the regaining of a fuller concept of the priesthood among anglicans. It is the fact that anglicans have chosen historically to remain in separation from other Christians whom they admit have the fullness of the priesthood in sufficient degree to be "valid". There has been a certain lack of desire for Church unity, and we have suggested that lack of unity is an imperfection in priesthood. Even this problem has been attacked by anglicans, however, and they are largely to be credited with supporting, if not initiating the movement for Christian unity in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. While a certain parochialism still resides in anglicanism, as it does in other separated communions, it cannot seriously be disputed that the record of the Lambeth Conferences has been one of pressure for the restoration of Christian unity. This signifies an anglican understanding that the fullness of Orders in the Church requires the unity of all Orders.

What more needs to be done? What are the remedies needed to restore a fullness of Orders and of Priesthood among separated Christians?

In the first instance, Christ's Priesthood for His Church must be accepted without qualification. Clear statements must be forthcoming that it is Christ's Priesthood which is wanted and nothing less. Within the liturgies for Ordination this is already said, but we must now go on to say it in a clearer and more pressing fashion.

In the internal forum (or the visibility of the Church to itself) we must call for nothing less than personal renewal. The ministries of the Church must search in humility for an understanding of Christ's ministry and Priesthood which is as full as possible. What Christ has done, and is doing, must be the criteria, not instead what we think would be a good way of setting up the ministry. This personal renewal will take the form of prayer, and humility, and sacrifice, because these are elements of Christ's Priesthood as well. Sacrifice may be the giving up of prerogatives which the State or the culture has given the clergy. It may mean suffering poverty or loneliness. But none of these are unknown to the Lord Himself. A greater fullness of Christ's Priesthood for the Church can only result from a greater participation in Christ by the Church's priests.

In the external forum (or the visibility of the People of God to the world) there must be an increasing movement to break down the formal and informal barriers which separate Christians and therefore are a scandal to the visible unity of the Body of Christ. In essence there must be radical escalation in participation in symbols of unity. On the fraternal level, whether between ordained or un-ordained Christians, there will be an increase in acts of embracing. There will be a manifestation of Christians' belonging to one another in incredibly more profound ways than they are separated from each other. Acts of embracing will demonstrate to the world that although Christians are still divided in

part, and although the divisions are the sources of great pain, they are not in the final analysis "real".

Alongside fraternal acts of embracing there will be acts on the hierarchical level as well. These will be acts of respect and submission. Respect will be shown up and down the hierarchical ladder, and across the lines of division. Submission will not be juridical submission, but the kind of submission that recognizes the gifts of the other and his greater fullness in participation in Christ's Priesthood, and which gives thanks to God for it.

The remedies to dis-union will require grace, but Christians are confident that grace is there for the asking. Personal renewal, fraternal and hierarchical symbols of unity, these will be the evidences and the fruits of the acceptance of that grace. The recognition that Priesthood in the Church is Christ's, the understanding that it is a continuum, and the consequent refusal to reject any ministry on the grounds that its understanding of fullness is "wrong", will make the way open to the reconciliation of separated Christian ministries through affirming the actuality of Christ's Priesthood in all of them, and encouraging the development of a greater fullness in all. This in the end is not the job for the theologians, but for the Holy Spirit, for whose help we pray.

### Concluding Postscript

Briefly, the concept of the "validity" of Orders must be jettisoned. It is altogether too black-and-white a concept. In its heart it is juridical. It seeks to judge, to separate good from bad. It is just this kind of judging and separating which we can no longer engage in, today, when we do not all share the same metaphysical understandings and consequently do not share the same theological or juridical methodologies.

Not only is "validity" a juridical and divisive concept, it is also an "establishment" one in the sense that it necessarily presupposes a kind of "true Church" outlook on the world. Christians cannot be divided into valid and invalid camps. Their common Baptism has destroyed the possibility of such a division. In the same sense, then, the common participation of all Christians in the Priesthood of Christ means that there are no Christians who do not have some fullness of that Priesthood in their ecclesial communities. Concepts of "true" and "false" no longer make sense in a situation where phenomenological, or existential, or functional statements are being made to describe the Church which is the Body of Christ.

The solution to the search for a new way to describe the phenomenon of the Christians' participation in the Priesthood of Christ, it is suggested, lies in understanding priesthood as a continuum. From Baptism through Episcopate

Christ's Priesthood is manifested and made visible in a continuum which admits of degrees such as "ordained" and "un-ordained", but which does not understand the concepts "valid" and "invalid".

Terms such as "authenticity" and "fullness" begin to describe the effect of a continuum with greater precision, and without the historical overtones of the language of "validity". Indeed, it is suggested, the pivotal breakthrough in ecumenism will come, if it has not already in the teaching of Vatican Council II, when descriptive terms such as "fullness" are substituted by Christians for juridical concepts such as "validity".

## Notes

### Introduction:

1. Principles of Church Union (Cincinnati, Ohio, Forward Movement Pub., 1966) pp. 48-49.

### Chapter One:

1. I Cor. 12:04-13; Eph. 4:11-12.
2. "Order, Holy" in Addis and Arnold, A Catholic Dictionary (London, 1960) p. 611; citing Tertullian Ad Uxor. 1,7.
3. "The Doctrine of the Sacrament of Orders", Trent Ses. xxiii; Denz. 958. <sup>a</sup>
4. ibid, Denz. 958.
5. cf. T. Ware, The Orthodox Church (Baltimore, Md., Penguin, 1964) chap. 10, passim
6. As is the situation of the Lutherans in Germany.
7. As is most clearly the case in connection with the somewhat later sect of "Quakers".
8. Especially interesting because of its acceptance of the latter position is, W. Wolf, A Plan of Church Union (Cambridge, Mass., 1966) p. 31 ff.
9. Vatican Council II, Decree on Ecumenism, in W. Abbot, ed., The Documents of Vatican II (N.Y., Guild et al, 1966) pp. 348-349.
10. The reports of the Conferences are contained in: The Lambeth Conferences (1867-1948) (London, SPCK, 1948); The Lambeth Conference 1948 (London, SPCK, 1948); and The Lambeth Conference 1958 (London, SPCK, 1958). Also of interest are: W. Curtis, The Lambeth Conferences (N.Y., Columbia, 1942); and L. Haselmayer, Lambeth and Unity (N.Y., Morehouse, 1948).

---

(a.) Notes to Denzinger (Denz.) are to paragraph numbers in Denzinger, The Sources of Catholic Dogma, Eng. tr. of the 30th ed., (St. Louis, Mo., Herder, 1957).

11. C.H. Simpkinson, ed., Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit (London, 1901) p. 441 ff.
12. E. McDermott, "Leo XIII and England" in E. Gargan, ed., Leo XIII and the Modern World (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1961) p. 137 ff.
13. ibid pp. 140-141; 152.
14. cf. S. Brandt, A Last Word on Anglican Ordinations (N.Y., 1897) which contains latin and english texts along with commentary.
15. Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae as litteras apostolicae Leonis xiii (London, 1897)
16. cf. The Conversation at Malines (1921-1925) (London, Oxford, 1927)
17. Issued during the Archbishop's visit to the Pope, March 23-26, 1966.
18. But see, F. Clark, Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention (London, Longmans, 1956) p. 192 ff.

#### Chapter Two:

1. The Book of Common Prayer (USA) p. 283 ff.
2. ibid pp. 290-291.
3. ibid p. 603 ff.
4. ibid p. 606
5. cf. I Cor. 3;3-7
6. This is the terminology used by Vatican Council II; cf: Decree on Ecumenism, Abbot, ed., op. cit. p. 355.
7. K. Rahner, The Church and the Sacraments (N.Y., Herder, 1963) pp. 18-19.
8. This inclusiveness is the profound witness of the references to the "catholic Church" in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
9. The concept of visibility is treated extensively throughout E. Schillebeeckx, Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1963).



10. The Book of Common Prayer p. 280.
11. cf: K. Rahner, "The Presence of Christ after Communion" in Theological Investigations Vol IV (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1966) pp. 314-315.
12. cf: K. Rahner, "Membership in the Church etc." in Theological Investigations Vol II (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1963) p. 1 ff, passim.
13. On the other hand, Orders may appear to be involved where the presence of a clergyman is required for reasons of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.
14. Denz. 1470.
15. The Book of Common Prayer p. 529.

### Chapter Three:

1. The Book of Common Prayer p. 529.
2. cf: K. Rahner, The Church and the Sacraments (N.Y., Herder, 1963) pp. 107-112.
3. This will be true if only one of the "couple" is baptized.
4. K. Rahner, The Church and the Sacraments (N.Y., Herder, 1963) pp. 33-34; B. Leeming, Principles of Sacramental Theology (London, Longmans, 1960) pp. 266-267.
5. But compare the emphasis put on diocesan bishops in, Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church in Abbot, ed., op. cit. p. 396 ff.
6. Canon 35, sec. 9.
7. K. Rahner, "Forgotten Truths Concerning the Sacrament of Penance" in Theological Investigations Vol II (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1963) p. 135 ff.
8. cf: the episcopal power to sanctify; Vatican Council II Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Abbot, ed., op. cit. p. 51.
9. Whereas Vatican Council I seems to have embraced the concept of "additional sharing" (vere episcopalis), Vatican Council II seems to have avoided it.

10. There is no evidence that other types of Orders were considered possible in the western Church. While various "minor" Orders have been understood, the offices of deacon, priest and bishop have gone unchallenged.
11. The Book Of Common Prayer p. 546.
12. This position is essentially that called Catharinian, cf: F. Clark, op. cit. p. 56 ff; Doctrine in the Church of England (London, SPCK, 1962) p. 135.
13. Sometimes called a "virtual" intention; cf: B. Leeming, op. cit. pp. 447-449.
14. cf? Holy Office Ruling in 1872 regarding Methodist Baptisms in Oceania; F. Clark, op. cit. p. 102.
15. This is essentially the argument of F. Clark, op. cit.
16. F. Clark, op. cit. p. 120 ff.
17. cf: Constitution Sacramentum Ordinis (1947, Pius XII) Acta Apostolicae Sedis Vol XL.

#### Chapter Four:

1. Vatican Council II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church chap. 3, in Abbot, ed., op. cit. p. 37 ff.; K. Rahner Bishops, their Status and Function (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1964) passim.
2. Vatican Council II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church in Abbot, ed., op. cit., p. 38.
3. Vatican Council II, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation in Abbot, ed., op. cit. pp. 118, 120.

#### Chapter Five:

1. The fact that anglican service books were available to the hypothetical observer, and therefore can be used to meet a charge of defect in the external forum has not been sufficiently stressed in discussions on anglican Orders. The Preface to the Ordinal is a part of the external situation precisely because the service books were available, and were written in a language the people could read.
2. cf: G. Dix, The Question of Anglican Orders (Westminster, Dacre, 1956) p. 33 and passim.

Bibliography

Two excellent bibliographies are to be found in F. Clark, Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention ( London, Longmans, 1956) and by the same author, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (Westminster, Newman, 1960). The following select bibliography is largely intended to supplement Fr. Clark's work. Some works listed below also appear in Clark.

-----

- Abbot, W., ed., The Documents of Vatican II (N.Y., Guild et al., 1966)
- Addis and Arnold, A Catholic Dictionary (London, 1960)
- Baillie, D. and Marsh, J., eds., Intercommunion (London, S.C.M., 1952)
- Bea, A., The Unity of Christians (N.Y., Herder, 1963)
- van Beeck, F.J., "Towards an Ecumenical Understanding of the Sacraments" in Journal of Ecumenical Studies Vol 3, No. 1.
- Berard, A. tr., Preparatory Reports: Second Vatican Council (Philadelphia, Pa., Westminster, 1965)
- Brandi, S.M., A Last Word on Anglican Ordinations (N.Y. 1897)
- Calvet, J., Rome and Reunion (Milwaukee, Morehouse, 1921, 1929)
- Carey, K.M., The Historic Episcopate 2d ed. (Westminster, Dacre, 1960)
- Cirlot, F.L., Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism (Lexington, Ky., Trafton, 1946)
- The Conversations at Malines (1921-1925) (London, Oxford, 1927)
- Curtis, W.R., The Lambeth Conferences (N.Y., Columbia, 1942)

- Denzinger, The Sources of Catholic Dogma eng. tr. of the 30th ed. (St. Louis, Mo., Herder, 1957)
- Dix, G., The Question of Anglican Orders (Westminster, Dacre, 1956)
- Doctrine in the Church of England (London, SPCK, 1962)
- Fairweather, E.R., Episcopacy Re-asserted (London, Mowbray, 1955)
- Gargan, E., ed., Leo XIII and the Modern World (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1961)
- Gelpi, D.C., Life and Light (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1966)
- Gille, A. (pseud. Fr. Jerome) A Catholic Plea for Reunion (London, Williams, 1934)
- Hardy, E.R., Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders (N.Y., Morehouse-Gorham, 1946)
- Haring, B., The Johanne Council (N.Y., Herder, 1963)
- Haselmayer, L.A., Lambeth and Unity (N.Y., Morehouse, 1948)
- Horton, D., Vatican Diary 1962 (Boston, United Church, 1964)
- \_\_\_\_\_, Vatican Diary 1963 (Boston, United Church, 1964)
- \_\_\_\_\_, Vatican Diary 1964 (Boston, United Church, 1965)
- Kirk, K.E., ed., The Apostolic Ministry (N.Y., Morehouse, 1946)
- Küng, H., Structures of the Church N.Y., Nelson, 1964)
- The Lambeth Conferences (1867-1948) (London, SPCK, 1948)
- The Lambeth Conference 1948 (London, SPCK, 1948)
- The Lambeth Conference 1958 (London, SPCK, 1958)
- Lecuyer, J., "Le Celebrant: Approfondissement theologique de sa function" in Maison-Dieu Vol 61
- \_\_\_\_\_, What is a Priest (N.Y., Hawthorne, 1959) Vol 53 of The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism
- Leeming, B., Principles of Sacramental Theology (London, Longmans, 1960)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Vatican Council and Christian Unity (N.Y., Harper and Row, 1966)

Lowndes, A., Vindication of Anglican Orders 2 vol (N.Y., Pott & Co., 1900)

Mascall, E.L., The Recovery of Unity (London, Longmans, 1958)

Neunheuser, B., Baptism and Confirmation (N.Y., Herder, 1964)

O'Callaghan, D., ed., Sacraments, the Gestures of Christ (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1964)

Papadopoulos, C., The Validity of Anglican Ordinations (London, Faith, 1930(?))

van de Pol, W.H., Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective (Pittsburg, Pa., Duquesne, 1965)

\_\_\_\_\_, World Protestantism (N.Y., Herder, 1964)

\_\_\_\_\_, Principles of Church Union (Cincinnati, Ohio, Forward Movement Pubs., 1966)

Puller, F.W., Orders and Jurisdiction (London, Longmans, 1925)

Rahner, K., Bishops, their Status and Function (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1964)

\_\_\_\_\_, The Church and the Sacraments (N.Y., Herder, 1963)

\_\_\_\_\_, The Dynamic Element in the Church (N.Y., Herder, 1964)

\_\_\_\_\_, Theological Investigations 4 (eng.) vols (Baltimore, Md., Helicon) Vol I (1961); Vol II (1963); Vol IV (1966); Vol V (1966)

\_\_\_\_\_, et al., Theological Dictionary (N.Y., Herder, 1965)

\_\_\_\_\_, Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Papae xiii (London, 1897)

Schillebeeckx, E., Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God (N.Y., Sheed and Ward, 1963)

Simpkinson, C.H., ed., Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit (London, 1901)

St. John, H., Essays in Christian Unity 1928-1954 (Westminster, Newman, 1955)

Stephenson, A.A., Anglican Orders (Westminster, Newman, 1956)

Todd, J.M., Catholicism and the Ecumenical Movement (London, Longmans, 1956)

Veuilliot, P., The Catholic Priesthood 2 vol (Westminster, Md., Newman, 1958, 1964)

Walker, L.J., The Problem of Reunion (London, Longmans, 1920)

Ware, T., The Orthodox Church (Baltimore, Md., Penguin, 1964)

Willebrands, J.G.M. ed., Problems before Unity (Baltimore, Md., Helicon, 1962)

Wolf, W.J., "The Minister of the Eucharist" (Privately distributed, 1966)

\_\_\_\_\_, A Plan of Church Union (Cambridge, Mass., 1966)

-----